The Contemporary Response to British Art before Ruskin's Modern Painters: An Examination of Exhibition Reviews Published in the British Periodical Press and the Journalist Art Critics who penned them, from the late Eighteenth Century to 1843.

(Two Volumes)

Volume One

Maura Barnett

Submitted for the degree of Ph.D.
to The University of Warwick
Department of the History of Art

November 1993

Contents

Volume One

Volume Two

Summary

A particular literary genre, the exhibition review, forms the subject of this dissertation. It represents one facet of a discourse which began to develop in Britain during the latter years of the eighteenth century. Art historians have become increasingly interested in such criticism, but have usually treated it, not as an historical phenomenon which in itself deserves a full investigation, but as a pool of evidence from which to draw remarks concerning individual artists or works of art.

It is argued that such a one-dimensional approach is unsatisfactory, but that in attempting to go beyond it, the methodological problems posed by this primary source need to be considered. It is stressed that the building up of a basic corpus of knowledge is very important, and an inventory of identified critics is presented in order to assist this. Some observations on the careers of these critics are given.

The exhibition reviews published in two contrasting periodicals, the Sun and The Examiner, form the subjects of case studies. The latter are known to have been penned by Robert Hunt and present no problems of attribution. The former are ascribed to John Taylor and the supporting evidence is put forward. The reviews are compared and it is shown how they differed according to their published contexts, and according to the idiosyncracies of their authors.

It is suggested that in spite of these differences, a shared critical idiom was a strong force which led reviewers to make many similar comments. This idiom and the precedents which determined its nature are examined. The ways in which it at once harboured and yet disguised certain ideologies are demonstrated. Evidence which helps to place reviews into a more rounded picture of the past is given in conclusion, including statements which show that contemporaries perceived the press as an important influence on the development of taste.

Introduction

'If the history of art criticism in England is ever written - it does not promise to be a brilliant book' Claude Colleer Abbott <1>

A particular literary genre, the exhibition review, forms the subject of this dissertation. It represents one facet of a discourse which began to develop in this country in the latter years of the eighteenth century: periodical art criticism <2>. Over the last decade or so, art historians have become increasingly interested in examining such criticism for the light it sheds on many aspects of art and society during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (particularly the nineteenth, which witnessed the flourishing of periodical literature) - and exhibition reviews especially have attracted the attention of those, who, applying their researches to individual artists, have been concerned with how such artists were received throughout their lives. Judy Crosby Ivy's recent Constable and the Critics (1991) <3> presents a catalogue of comments made by those who reviewed the works exhibited by this artist during his career. The catalogue brings together criticisms taken from approximately sixty different British periodicals and spans the years 1807 to 1837. Bearing in mind that Ivy's catalogue is restricted to the response of periodical art critics to just one artist's career (and not necessarily the most often reviewed artist at that), its size, which is sufficient to fill a small volume, and the fact that it took Ivy a decade to gather the raw data, should put this doctoral thesis into perspective: initially intended to examine the even

wider phenomenon of art criticism published in the British press, and now taking exhibition reviewing as its main focus, it nevertheless can only hope to scratch the surface of what is a large and still relatively unexplored primary source.

The scholarly significance of Ivy's book is threefold: Firstly, it is representative of the growing interest since the 1950s in the wealth of information to be found in the nineteenth century periodical press. Secondly, it forms part of that trend in British art historical research which has seen a shift away from the tracing of stylistic developments towards a greater concern with the interactions between art and society. Thirdly, it demonstrates how art historians have typically approached nineteenth century periodical art criticism: that is, as evidence to throw light on the reception of a particular artist or work of art, rather than as an historical phenomenon which in itself needs deeper analysis.

An even more recent publication, Andrew Hemingway's Landscape Imagery and Urban culture in Early Nineteenth Century Britain (1992) <4> reveals that this growing interest in nineteenth century journalist art criticism is now resulting in some scholarly investigation along the latter lines (as indeed does this dissertation). A chapter in Hemingway's book examining some of the links between the overall political tendencies of a selection of periodicals and the aesthetic and political values demonstrated in the writings of their art critics is pertinent to this study, not just in terms of the findings, but also in terms of the methodology employed. Since the present dissertation places some emphasis on methodological problems, and at one level Hemingway's approach must be seen as a methodological solution, it will

be necessary to refer to his study on a number of occasions throughout the following pages.

Chapter One, below, examines how the barriers erected by academic disciplines, fashions in academic research, prejudices and preconceptions connected with literary genre, and how the dispersed nature of these periodical writings have all contributed to the slow advance of scholarship in this field. Hence, Ivy's book, although representative of one of the most up to date publications, accurately asserts that 'research into "popular" art criticism in the periodical press is still in its early stages' <5>, and, Hemingway quite rightly points out that 'The criticism of the periodical press has only been mined to discover comments on individual works, and no general analysis of it has been published' <6>. The extent to which a doctoral thesis can modify this situation must necessarily be modest, but the following pages hope to contribute to scholarship by drawing attention to the, as yet largely unacknowledged, methodological problems which this primary source presents to the art historian (Chapter One); by bringing together information on some of the critics (Chapter Two); by providing case studies of two contrasting periodicals and their critics (Chapters Three and Four); by presenting some cautious observations concerning the language and criteria used in exhibition reviews (Chapter Five); and by providing a short discussion of the historical context (Chapter Six).

The history of British art criticism envisaged by Claude Colleer Abbott (quoted at the head of this Introduction), or the 'general analysis' proposed by Hemingway will not be found in the following pages: the main aspirations of this dissertation being to provide a spring board for further research, to provoke questions, to analyse

certain problems, suggest solutions, and to draw conclusions which acknowledge the limitations of what can be deduced given the present state of knowledge. A definitive history of British art criticism is still very much a future prospect, if a *methodical analysis* of a *substantial proportion* of the writings of periodical art critics is to be included in such a work. Nevertheless, if such a history eventually appears, on the basis of what we know so far, we might ask whether Abbott's somewhat unpropitious prediction will be fulfilled. At one level, some of the findings of this study tend to support his point of view in the sense that few of the art reviews of the early nineteenth century make obviously 'exciting' reading, and indeed a unpublished M.A. thesis in 1977 concluded, rather depressingly, that 'Despite the good intentions of the majority of critics, the strongest impression produced by the criticism and reviewing of this period, is its general worthlessness' <7>. However, one must ask in whose terms should such a notion of 'worth' be defined and should be wary of confusing certain qualitative evaluations with historical importance.

In the serendipitous fashion in which links in research are often formed, a temporary exhibition <8> attended by the present author during the preparation of this dissertation, included a small and fragile object which offers rare and powerful evidence for the historical significance of these journalistic art critical writings and the value of their study: this object (Pls. 1&2) is one of a set of information bats (c.1825), made for the benefit of visitors to Sir John Fleming Leicester's collection at Tabley House. Significant, simply in terms of evidence of the use of intermediary devices between work of art (Pl.3) and spectator during this time, the information bat is pertinent to this

thesis since one side of its text has been formed by pasting a cutting from the Fine Arts column of the weekly newspaper, the Literary Gazette on to its surface [Appendix I]. (The other side I have been able to identify as a poem by Letitia Elizabeth Landon written in ink, so faded as to be mostly illegible, and in Sir John's hand <9>[Appendix II]). That journalistic art criticism was sufficiently respected to play this role, (which might, in some respects, be regarded as more elevated than its original function), is of no small significance to the present study and should serve as a warning against evaluations which might tend to indulge ahistorical and subjective responses. The information bat enables us to begin to gauge the value which contemporaries gave to these writings and to appreciate their contribution to the complex relationships between artist, works of art and art consumers during this period. It clearly indicates that journalistic art criticism was important for the creators and spectators of fine art and that to increase our understanding of them will be to increase our understanding of nineteenth-century art history.

Chapter One

The Primary Source Considered

This chapter considers the emergence of exhibition reviewing in Britain and defines the subject under study. It assesses the current state of research and concludes by analysing the methodological problems associated with the primary source under investigation.

The period from 1793 to 1828 is the principal concern of this dissertation, for these years encompass the careers of John Taylor and Robert Hunt - the critics who form the subjects of the case studies presented in Chapters Three and Four. Appropriately, this focus of attention coincides with a significant era in the history of periodical literature, because it was during the first two decades of the nineteenth century that this type of reading matter burgeoned. At the beginning of the century however, the British exhibition review was less than forty years old, and so this study gives consideration to some of those earlier reviews and their precedents, in order to see how they shaped the nature of the critical vocabulary and criteria. The prerequisites for the development of this new literary genre had been the growth of a public periodical press and the establishment of regular public exhibitions of works of art. While the former was becoming a regular part of society at the beginning of the eighteenth century <1>, the latter occurred only when the first exhibition was held at the Society of Arts in 1760 <2>, but this exhibition did not excite much response from the press. When the first exhibition of the Royal Academy occurred in 1768, a stable forum for exhibitions was finally secured, though exhibition reviewing in the press was still very erratic, because

at this stage newspaper editors relied mainly on the unsolicited commentaries provided by correspondents <3>. During the early 1770s, reviewing began in earnest and newspapers started to publish their own reviews, rather than depending on chance letters sent to the editor. Notably in 1773, Henry Bate, the editor of the Morning Post began systematically reviewing the Royal Academy exhibitions in order to exercise his championship of Gainsborough <4>. The earliest commentators on the Royal Academy exhibitions employed a set of criteria and a vocabulary which had characteristics in common with exhibition reviews written throughout the period under study. Since the publication of exhibition reviews in the British press was a new phenomenon, the language that critics used must have been derived from earlier forms of art criticism and other related discourses: academic theory (particularly theories from France and Reynolds' Discourses), connoisseurs' guides and books on art, more general eighteenth century aesthetic treatises, and the conversational idioms used by connoisseurs, collectors and art dealers. Some of these precedents and their effects on exhibition reviews are discussed further in Chapter Five.

As regular exhibitions had been established considerably earlier in France than in Britain, so too had that country acquired a tradition of exhibition reviewing prior to the emergence of the British exhibition review. Hélène Zmijewska's article 'La Critique des Salons en France avant Diderot' and books by Tom Crow and Neil McWilliam demonstrate the extent of critical writing which had already appeared in France by the time Britain held its first public exhibition <5>. However, it appears unlikely that the earliest British exhibition reviewers were directly influenced by their French counterparts since the rudimentary and

sciolistic commentaries which were furnished to British newspapers in the 1760s and 1770s by those anonymous correspondents who adopted such signatures as 'A Friend to the Arts, though no Connoisseur', 'A Dilettante', 'A Virtuoso' and so on <6>, are incomparable with French criticism of the same period which had reached a much greater level of sophistication particularly with the Salons of Diderot. As Iain Pears has commented: during the early and middle decades of the eighteenth century, British writing on art had been

> dominated by two elements, the virtuoso and the 'philosophic', one concerned totally with the facts of art, the other treating the subject only tangentially and seeking instead a moral and 'civic' structure in which it could be enclosed. Almost entirely lacking, however, was a strain which might have derived from the interests of the connoisseur or critic. Indeed, aesthetic commentary on painting was never an English speciality, as a comparison of French Salon criticism of the 1760s and 1770s and the infrequent, crude and vitually incoherent English equivalent readily demonstrates. While French critics such as Diderot or La Font de Saint Yenne wrote in a style adapted from the mainstream of philosophic and literary criticism, much of the English commentary on exhibitions originated in the satire, the burlesque and the newspaper article. <7>

The exhibition review emerged then, rather falteringly, as a new literary genre in this country, having little in common with its more mature equivalent on the other side of the Channel.

In considering its development as part of the overall phenomenon of rise of the periodical press, it is important to bear in mind the demographic and sociological changes which saw the growth of the middle

classes, the spread of literacy and an increase in the number of people who were able to afford leisure time during the period under study <8>. Without such changes there would never have been that massive increase in the demand for periodical literature which occurred once the nineteenth century had begun <9>. The sociological impact of this type of literature undoubtedly provided an important force in helping to shape a cohesive middle class culture, for not only did many periodicals assume the role of cultural advisers (particularly in terms of recommending what other literature was worth reading) they provided a form of reading matter which was unusually public: available in reading rooms and coffee shops and frequently passed among several individuals, their contents must often have provided the topic of conversation. In addition, many of them invited public participation by providing space for readers' correspondence.

The growth of the periodical press at the beginning of the nineteenth century manifested a market demand for diversity, which can be seen in the range of periodicals available (they could vary in frequency of publication and size, political stance <10>, degree of seriousness <11>, degree of fashionableness <12>, the sex of their intended readership <13> and so on), and in their incredible variety in terms of content, so that an exhibition review, although often placed next to reviews of other forms of entertainment like drama and music, could rub shoulders with articles covering any number of topics: the articles either side of three randomly chosen Royal Academy reviews comprise: 'Proceedings of Learned Societies' and 'Anecdotes of Mozart's Childhood' <14>, 'Naval News' and 'Sporting Intelligence' <15>, 'The Opera' and 'An Attempt to Shew the Folly and Danger of Methodism' <16>. Such a context possibly

affected the nature of the reviews themselves and certainly must have influenced the way in which they were read and appreciated. For instance, the exhibition reviews which were published in periodicals such as The Examiner, The New Monthly Magazine and The Literary Gazette, all of which carried regular (or at least frequent) Fine Arts columns, presumably had a more captive readership than those which were published unexpectedly alongside other miscellaneous news <17>. Or, exhibition reviews which were published next to, or near to political commentary might have found their significance altered by the political context. Even apparently minor details like the length of reviews, their format, placing on the page, and their type-face might have affected the readers' responses <18>.

As has been pointed out, exhibition reviews represented just one aspect of a larger discourse and other forms of art criticism could be found within the pages of the periodical press. Articles such as reviews of fine art publications and news of new engravings <19>, discussions of the state of the arts in Britain and the role of the Royal Academy or British Institution <20>, discussions of sculpture both ancient and modern <21>, discussions of new monuments to commemorate some event or person <22>, travel articles <23>, news of more popular forms of art like dioramas and panoramas <24>, perhaps even some advertisements, could all contain passages which might be classed as art criticism. An analysis of all such material would certainly reveal new insights into early nineteenth century attitudes towards the visual arts and contribute to the history of taste. However, by choosing exhibition reviews as its main focal point, this dissertation not only makes a necessary, albeit rather artificial, restraint on its compass, but also

complements current research by concentrating on the type of periodical art criticism which has so far received the greatest amount of attention from historians of nineteenth century art.

As will be seen later in this chapter, the increasing tendency for art historians to turn to nineteenth century exhibition reviews for evidence, represents part of a growing concern with the relationships between art and society, and particularly with the reception of new works of art by press and public. This last concern accounts for the fact that in the field of art history, exhibition reviews have generally received more attention than the other sorts of article mentioned above. This at least provides a starting point for research while the art criticism in the nineteenth century periodical press is still a relatively unexplored primary source and, it may even bear some relation to the relative importance of exhibition reviews which represent a special type of art criticism, both in terms of the concentration of critical comment which characterises their content, and in terms of their immediacy in being a direct measure of contemporary taste. It is also helpful that because 'exhibition review' (or its synonym 'art review') defines a particular literary genre, it is a term whose meaning is quite clear (i.e. any piece of writing whose main aims are to describe and to evaluate at least one, but more usually a number, of publically exhibited works of art), whereas the less precise term 'art criticism' cannot be so easily defined and is applicable to a great range of different writings. Vainker's thesis <25> makes a point of distinguishing between art critics and art reviewers, but the way in which he does so implies that art criticism and exhibition reviews are two separate categories or genres. This is misleading since art

criticism is surely a generic term of which the exhibition review represents a particular species, therefore an exhibition reviewer is, by definition, also an art critic.

Vainker's distinction embodies an attitude, examined in greater detail below, which has resulted in exhibition reviews being assigned less weight in terms of their contribution to aesthetic theory compared with other forms of art criticism. Such an implied hierarchy is demonstrated in the following quotatation from Helene E Roberts, who like Vainker, puts reviews and art criticism into two distinct categories:

> Art reviews do not rank very high in the scale of literary genre... Like their more prestigious relation, art criticism, art reviews seek to describe and evaluate works of art, but they are not expected to have that measure of analysis and depth that marks good criticism. <26>

While characteristics like importance, quality and depth of analysis are certainly pertinent to any attempt to gain a deeper understanding of exhibition (or art) reviews, it is not particularly helpful or relevant to use such criteria as a basis for distinguishing between two different types of writing in this way. The term art criticism must embrace a whole body of literature on art, including exhibition reviews, each individual piece of writing capable of varying in its degree of importance, depth of analysis and so on. Exhibition reviews differ from some other forms of art criticism, simply because in being dependent upon evaluating a predetermined selection of works of art, they are responsive rather than prescriptive in nature and consequently their theoretical basis is often hidden. While the findings of the present

study suggest that it is probably fair to state that the exhibition review in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was frequently limited in its depth of analysis, this is not an axiomatic quality of the genre. It therefore, perhaps tells us something of the perceived expectations and capacities of writers and their readership during the period.

Turning from an attempt to define the subject of this study to an examination of the current state of research, it should be pointed out at the onset, that one of the most recent assessments, that of Judy Crosby Ivy, quoted above (p3), places academic progress in the field of '"popular" art criticism in the periodical press', in its early stages. Nevertheless, it was over sixty years ago that Claude Colleer Abbott, also quoted above (p1) saw, albeit in rather unfavourable terms, the potential for a book on the history of English art criticism. It might be tempting to ascribe the lack of advance during the intervening years to the negative attitude perpetrated by Abbott who anticipated so inauspiciously that such a book was doomed to mediocrity simply owing to the nature of its subject matter. However, the neglect of this primary source can be attributed more accurately to academic prejudices and fashions and the history of scholarship generally, as well as to specific methodological problems which, although they remain still largely unacknowledged, present a major obstacle to a comprehensive analysis and understanding of the art criticism published in the periodical press during the first half of the nineteenth century.

In considering the first of these causes, the academic prejudices which have hampered research have stemmed from the fact that as a subject for research, this primary source does not happily find a place

in any conventional academic discipline. Hence, it has been studied in the context of the history of aesthetics, of literature and of art: each case either resulting in a rather partial view of the subject or a tendency to overlook its historical significance.

Since historians of aesthetics tend to try to identify coherent theories and aesthetic movements, the dispersed writings of the journalist art critics of the nineteenth century have received only a small amount of attention from them, unless written by well-known literary figures such as Hazlitt <27> and Thackeray <28>, but whose art criticisms (and more specifically exhibition reviews) form a relatively small part of their entire oeuvre. Hazlitt's official role as art critic was for a short period in 1814 and 1815 for the Morning Chronicle and The Champion <29> and Thackeray's art criticisms consist mainly of his articles in Fraser's Magazine 1838 to 1845, one article in Ainsworth's Magazine <30>, contributions to Pictorial Times March to May 1843 <31>, and a number of exhibition reviews in the Morning Chronicle in the 1840s <32>. In contrast, Robert Hunt, who forms one of the subjects for our case-studies (see Chapters Three and Four below), had a continuous career as The Examiner's art critic from the year of its foundation in 1808 until 1828 and wrote art criticism for other periodicals and fine art publications, but has been omitted from nearly all histories of aesthetics <33>. His stable career as an art critic for one single publication was probably less typical than the erratic careers of Hazlitt and Thackeray (as will be seen in the biographical sketches given in Appendix III and analysed in Chapter Two below), but as a writer with a large part of his oeuvre easy to identify and as a specialist in his field (it seems that he did not dabble in drama and

literary criticism, unlike many of his contemporaries) his writings ought to have a place in the history of British art theory. Nevertheless, his life and writings, although they have recently begun to attract attention (particularly with regard to what he had to say about Constable <34>), have not yet formed the main subject of any academic study.

Peter Funnell <35> has asserted that research into art theory in England of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has produced 'a picture which is ... distorted by a concentration on "major" figures', and cites Hazlitt as a principal example. What is still very hard to determine, but should at least be questioned, is whether the amount of scholarly attention that has been given to, say, Hazlitt's periodical writings and in particular his art criticism bears any relationship with their importance in his lifetime, when as anonymous and pseudonymous articles in newspapers and journals they were competing for public attention in a different literature market. To a certain extent the scholarly neglect of lesser known critics like Hunt bears some relation to the public recognition (or lack of it) which they received in their life-times and there may be a case for arguing that this is a just gauge of their historical importance, for Hunt's death in 1850 produced no reaction from the periodical press <36>, whereas Hazlitt's death in 1830 resulted in eleven obituaries <37>. However, Hunt fell on hard times and spent his last years in Charterhouse <38>, whereas by the end of his life Hazlitt had achieved considerable notoriety, not just as an art critic, but as an essayist generally. It is undoubtedly accurate to claim that Hazlitt achieved greater fame in his lifetime than Hunt did, but this does not necessarily imply that it is historically correct to

give more weight to Hazlitt's than to Hunt's periodical art criticism (ignoring for the time being, the numerous unidentified critics) since such writings formed only a part of Hazlitt's entire output. The process of singling out Hazlitt's writings was fostered by P P Howe publishing twenty-one volumes of his collected works in the 1930s <39>, thus making his works considerably more accessible, (as well as encouraging that type of analysis which has little regard for the context in which these writings originally appeared <40>), but it should be noted that only one volume <41> comprises the type of journalistic art criticism which forms the basis of this study, and if Hunt's writings were similarly published in a collected form they would fill several volumes <42>. It will be seen then that the distorted picture of art theory noted by Funnell, is also connected with the varying accessibility of certain critics' writings <43>.

Another reason for the neglect of journalist art criticism by historians of aesthetics again concerns the nature of their published medium. There has been a tendency to associate literary genre with intellectual weight (a point already touched upon). For instance, Claude Abbott has suggested that although it would be possible to try to form a theory out of George Darley's periodical art criticism, such an attempt would be erroneous: 'Darley was a contributor to the Athenaeum from the beginning of 1834 till his death in 1846, and the most important part of his prose writings in that review deals with questions of art. These contributions to criticism are by their nature, occasional, scattered, and unequal in value. They include the letters from abroad, reviews, notes on exhibitions and picture-sales. Any

attempt to construct a theory of aesthetics from such material (though a theory is implicit) would be both unwise and unnecessary' <44>.

Although Abbott does not clearly explain why he thinks it would be wrong to try to scrutinise the theoretical basis of Darley's writings, his reasons seem to be linked to the fact that the writings appear not to have been conceived as a coherent whole or with the exposition of a particular theory as their primary object. Likewise we see Norman Bryson making a similar connection between literary genre and intellectual worth, whilst lamenting, extraordinarily enough, Hazlitt's *neglect*: 'By now Hazlitt is rather a forgotten figure in aesthetic discussion... and for this neglect, Hazlitt has perhaps only himself to blame. While a patient assemblage of his scattered and fragmented remarks on painting does, in fact, yield some remarkable findings, there is no single, sustained elaboration of his theory, no one work in scale or intensity comparable to Reynolds' Discourses of Ruskin's Modern Painters. And at first it seems presumptuous to place Hazlitt in such company' <45>.

Bryson, however, by blaming Hazlitt for his own 'neglect' and by comparing his writings with those of Reynolds and Ruskin, has surely distorted historical truth, since the periodical press was a fashionable, and arguably powerful, literary genre during Hazlitt's time and he cannot be blamed for making it his vehicle. Moreover, it should be remembered that Reynolds' Discourses and Ruskin's Modern Painters represent two entirely different literary genres and like Hazlitt's writings were conceived to different ends at different times. Reynolds' Discourses for instance, which were written as the texts of speeches delivered over a period of fifteen years, have some of the improvisatory

qualities and inconsistencies which we would also associate with the periodical literature which forms the basis of this study (though it may be argued that Reynolds initial intention was to have presented a set of theoretically coherent arguments, and that it was changes in society and changing attitudes towards academic theory which obliged him to alter his plan <46>).

If we consider Bryson's suggestion that it might be 'presumptuous' to place Hazlitt's criticisms in the same company as Reynolds' Discourses and Ruskin's Modern Painters we come to perhaps a deep rooted prejudice which helps to explain why the periodical art critics of the nineteenth century have been neglected by historians of aesthetics. It is not just that the scattered remarks of these critics make it hard to pin down coherent aesthetic theories, but that there is an underlying prejudice against crediting much value to a group of writings which can be described by a word which so frequently has pejorative connotations: journalism. Hence we find Leonello Venturi in his discussion of nineteenth century French art criticism, although acknowledging its 'incomparable merit of being attached to art in the making', nevertheless complaining that it had the 'defect of journalistic improvisation' and 'often lacked sufficient historical and aesthetic information' <47>. Or J D O'Hara prefacing an examination of some aspects of British nineteenth century periodical art criticism with the remarks:

> The criticism in these periodicals may, perhaps, deserve serious study and sober evaluation. My present review of it is concerned to evoke its characteristics without taking it seriously and to treat journalism merely as journalism <48>

I do not wish to imply here that we should ignore the qualitative differences which might exist between say, a weighty and extensively prepared aesthetic treatise and a more spontaneous journalistic writing, conceived with only an ephemeral function in mind, but to stress the danger of treating 'journalism merely as journalism'. That is, if we do evaluate such writings solely in terms of their apparent intellectual worth, we must remember that present day evaluations do not necessarily correspond with those of the past. In view of this we should be wary of overlooking the historical context of such writings altogether, or even worse still, of using twentieth century values as a measure of their importance to contemporaries. It should be remembered that in a pre-telephonic and pre-televisual age, written journalism was *the* method of public communication and therefore played a different role to that of today. In addition, such evidence as the information bat from Tabley suggests that the journalistic art criticism of the nineteenth century perhaps enjoyed a more respectable literary status than most recent scholarship into aesthetic theory is prepared to credit to it. O'Hara's nagging suspicion that this art criticism does indeed 'deserve serious study and sober evaluation' should be, and is being, acted upon.

The necessities for a serious study involving any of the material to be found among the pages of the periodical press are basic tools for enabling researchers to gauge the size of their primary source and to locate the parts which are of interest to them. The compilation of indexes and finding lists for nineteenth century periodicals has concerned historians of literature during the last forty years or so, beginning with the British-Union Catalogue of Periodicals (1955-1960), continuing with the first volume of W Houghton's Wellesley Index to

Victorian Periodicals 1824 to 1900 (four subsequent volumes now exist), and being consolidated by the formation of the Research Society for Victorian Periodicals (RSVP) and the first volume of Victorian Periodicals Newsletter <49> in January 1968. The four volumes of the Wellesley Index which provide information on the contents and contributors of forty-three different periodicals (the fifth is an Epitome and Index) are supplemented by similar ventures on individual periodicals such a Riga and Prance's Index to the London Magazine <50>. Such indexes can greatly affect the ease with which certain types of analyses can be undertaken. If available for particular periodicals, they make it possible to find out at a glance, in what years and on what dates (if at all), reviews of, say, the annual exhibition of the Royal Academy were published, as well as giving perhaps clues on authorship. Unindexed periodicals must be physically searched: a time consuming and not always reliable process. For instance, Butlin and Joll's catalogue of The Paintings of J M W Turner states that a review of Turner's painting *Spithead: Boat's Crew Recovering an Anchor* by Robert Hunt in the Examiner mentioned by A J Finberg is now untraceable <51>. This assertion is inaccurate and perhaps arose from the review being missed in a search, or maybe a missing page in the editon consulted was overlooked <52>. Even Ivy's collection of criticisms of Constable's works, which for thoroughness exceeds all other attempts (and is given further discussion later in this chapter), is not free from this type of human error <53>.

Some indexes exist now which work the other way round. Instead of indexing a particular periodical, they take a subject and provide a list of the periodicals and occasions when the subject appeared. For

instance Antonia Forster's Index to Book Reviews in England 1749-1774, (Illinois, 1990) and William S Ward's Literary Reviews in British Periodicals (three volumes covering the period 1798 to 1826, London, vols.1 and 2, 1972, vol.3, 1978), both of which enable the reader to locate reviews of certain eighteenth and nineteenth books. With regard to exhibition reviews in British periodicals no such detailed indexes exist <54>. So it is not possible to know if the Royal Academy exhibition of 1800, say, was reviewed by five or fifty-five periodicals <55>, let alone whether a particular painting was mentioned in any of the reviews, unless searches through a great number of periodicals are carried out <56>. This naturally makes some types of comparative analyses, if a complete picture of the periodical response to a certain exhibition or painting is required, very labour-intensive indeed.

Although historians of literature have seen the necessity for creating research tools to assist studies which use the nineteenth century periodical press, the work carried out within the RSVP framework is of limited use for this study, since its emphasis on 'Victorian Periodicals' has meant that the first couple of decades of the nineteenth century have received little attention. Also, because RSVP has tended to stress the literary importance of Victorian periodicals, not many historians whose interest concern the relationships between the visual arts and this literature have published in Victorian Periodicals Review. One exception is Helene E Roberts whose articles complement this study and are discussed further towards the end of this chapter.

Turning to consider the contribution which art history has made to the subject under study, it might be noted that changes within this discipline have not only meant that greater attention is now being given

to the relationships between art and society, but during the last three decades or so, we have seen British art history changing from an area of little interest to quite a fashionable field for research and publication. This can probably be explained by the simple fact that academics follow trends as much as anyone, particularly as their activity usually takes place within institutionalised structures. The principal mode of academic intercourse, publication, tends to have a self-generating effect: articles react to other articles and publishers are more willing to invest in the production of a book if they are certain its subject matter is topical.

As has already been mentioned, the tendency so far, has been for art historians to approach British nineteenth century periodical art criticism for evidence of the reception of a particular artist or work of art, not to make it their primary object of study. This line of approach, in spite of the trend which has meant that recent studies of nineteenth century artists now invariably include at least a handful of quotations from the periodical press <57>, has not been accompanied by much in-depth consideration as to the value of such quotations as historical evidence. In 1986 Jed Perl, complained:

> It sometimes seems in the new studies that the artists themselves fade from view, washed over by a stream of quotations from a bottomless primary source, the periodical press. <58>

This complaint, although perhaps more applicable to studies of later nineteenth-century art (most historians of the early nineteenth century have yet to use the periodical press to such excess), nevertheless encapsulates two important problems. How can the art historian get to grips with this vast amount of critical writing, without getting swamped

by it? To what extent can a critic's remarks simply quoted out of context really enhance our understanding of the contemporary reaction to the art of this period? For example, if we take a publication such as Butlin and Joll's catalogue of the works of Turner, we find an abundance of quotations <59> like 'The Literary Chronicle for 22 June referred to the picture as...' <60> or 'the critic of the Athenaeum, 12 May, wrote...' <61> which undoubtedly give us the flavour of the sorts of comments that critics used in their exhibition reviews. However, without knowing anything about the anonymous critics quoted or about the way in which they responded to other works, without knowing anything about the periodicals in which they wrote, and without knowing the extent to which the language and sentiments of the critiques are typical or exceptional, how far can such quotations be of value? To take a number of simple examples: if an unfavourable critique is quoted out of context, it may not indicate that a particular painting had a negative reception generally, but may simply reflect the disposition of a particular reviewer who tended to point out defects rather than good qualities in all his critiques. Or, a flattering review, even if representative of the general response, would be more significant coming from a critic whose overall tendency was to review unfavourably. Furthermore, the contemporary impact of any critique cannot be gauged unless something is known about the importance of the periodical in which it was published and we ought also to be aware of how the political stance of the periodical may have affected its content.

It is important not only to consider questions such as these, but also to think about the variety of ways in which reviews functioned in the past: although this dissertation stresses the point that in order to

gain a greater historical understanding of reviews we should pay more attention to their published context, we should not forget that they were capable of functioning in other ways at the time they were written - as press cuttings pasted into scapbooks and on to an information bat, or as quotations copied into diaries and passed on in letters, and so forth. This should draw our attention to the fact that while for the most part reviews represented a facet of a wider discourse (that of periodical literature) their historical importance also includes their use in other contexts. The type of approach which simply quotes isolated critiques as examples of the press response to a particular work of art or artist, igores both these issues.

What might be aptly described as the 'quotation approach' to nineteenth century art reviewing, has been taken almost to its ultimate point with Judy Crosby Ivy's Constable and the Critics <62>, and as a consequence this book makes an interesting and valuable contribution to the study of this criticism. The reason for this is because it represents the most thorough attempt so far, to collect the entire critical response to one particular artist's career, being the result of systematic searches through forty periodicals, as well as including additional remarks extracted less systematically from a further twenty: in its near-comprehensiveness it surpasses any other previous publication which gathers up critiques in this way <63>. Butlin and Joll's catalogue of Turner's works for example, in spite of being liberally filled with quotations from many different periodicals, states that the authors have 'quoted freely from the exhibition notices which appeared in the newpapers and journals of the day' <64> using an adverb which does not suggest that the quoted critiques have been selected

using any particular criteria, or indicate if the authors have made systematic searches through any particular periodicals tends, in consequence to be unsatisfactory for various reasons. Certain periodicals are quoted for some paintings, but not for others, even though they reviewed the paintings in question: it is difficult to know why, for instance, in its entry for *A Country Blacksmith disputing upon the price of Iron...* <65> Butlin and Joll's catalogue quotes from The St. James' Chronicle, The Monthly Magazine, and The Cabinet or Monthly Report of Polite Literature, but does not print The Sun's critique which makes an interesting and revealing comment on how Turner's *Blacksmith (Pl.4)* and Wilkie's *Blind Fiddler* (Pl.5) had been hung 'in such a situation as to invite and provoke comparison' <66>. As The Sun is quoted elsewhere in the catalogue, we cannot tell if its omission from this entry has been the consequence of deliberate selection or whether the authors were simply unaware of this review. This would have mattered less if the authors had avoided making generalising remarks such as 'the press was on the whole favourable' <67> without giving any indication of the size of the sample on which such a generalisation was based or how such a sample was selected <68>. What Ivy's catalogue of Constable criticisms does, in contrast, is to quote all the reviews from which she draws her generalisations as well as giving a clear indication of the periodicals through which she attempted to search entire runs. This enables us to distinguish typical and untypical reviews with greater accuracy in order to get an overall picture of how critics reacted to the artist throughout his career. It is only because Ivy has been so thorough, that in her account of the critical reaction to Constable, we can trust her generalisations with an unprecedented

certainty and in this respect her book greatly enhances our current knowledge of nineteenth century art criticism.

The artificial boundaries which separate academic disciplines, and which have encouraged a fragmentary approach to the art criticism in the British periodical press, are decreasing in their influence and in recent years it has become more acceptable, and often acknowedged as preferable, to study certain subjects in a interdisciplinary manner. Hence, the present study mixes art history, social history and the history of art theory, and Ivy's book mentioned above, in addition to its catalogue of Constable criticisms and its summary of the critical reaction to Constable throughout his career, offers some general observations on periodical art criticism, makes a brief comparison between some of the critical comments directed towards Constable and towards other landscape painters, and presents some brief information on one or two identified critics, especially Edward Dubois, whose criticisms are notable for their consistent deprecation of Constable's works and their frequent use of personal abuse.

So, let us conclude this assessment of current research by outlining some other recent studies which have taken the art criticism in the nineteenth century periodical press as their primary subject and have attempted to increase our understanding of it as an end in itself, rather than treating it as subordinate to some other matter. Some of this complementary scholarship, will naturally be referred to again during the course of this dissertation, but as it forms quite a small body of literature in total, it has been considered valuable to give an overall view of it here. The main attempt to offer a comprehensive coverage of this subject was made by Vainker in 1977 <69> whose M.A.

dissertation, already quoted, by attempting too much, unfortunately resulted in rather too many generalisations and a somewhat superficial analysis, and for these reasons makes a limited contribution to scholarship. Despite this, its Appendix, 'intended as a checklist of all the newpapers and periodicals published between 1780 and 1830 which contain information relative to the fine arts' is an invaluable aid to anyone intending to study this subject. Helene E Roberts had already published a similar checklist in Victorian Periodicals Review in 1970 <70>, but limted herself to those periodicals specialising in the visual arts, as did Antony Burton in his chapter 'Nineteenth Century Periodicals', in the 1976 publication The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines <71>.

Helene E Roberts' other articles comprise: 'Art Reviewing in the Early Nineteenth Century Art Periodicals' <72>, 'Trains of Fascinating and of Endless Imagery: Associationist Art Criticism Before 1850' <73>, 'Exhibition and Review: the periodical press and the Victorian art exhibition system <74>, and 'Periodicals and Art History' <75>. The first of these articles offers some observations on critics' attitudes towards the Royal Academy (particularly complaints concerning its rules and practices), the language and criteria of critics, and the critical reactions to Turner, Etty and Mulready. The next, examines the influence of associationism, especially the ideas of Archibald Alison, on periodical art criticism. It argues that many reviewers, although not necessarily acquainted with Alison's writings, were familiar with associationist ideas and used them in their criticisms and that such associations, at first historical and literary, were developed into kinaesthetic and psychic reactions by Hazlitt, and in the 1830s and 40s

became increasingly influenced by moral and sentimental responses to an art which increasingly exploited such emotions. 'Exhibition and Review: the periodical press and the Victorian art exhibition system' looks at some of the attitudes expressed by writers in the periodical press from the 1830s to the 1890s, towards the role of critics, the exhibiting institutions at the time, the merits and disadvantages of the exhibiting system itself and the effects of the commercialisation of art. 'Periodicals and Art History' is a bibliographic guide.

Roberts' work offers some valuable insights into periodical art criticism, but she does not consider the effects of the periodical press as a medium: either in terms of how such a medium may have affected the writings themselves or in terms of how it might have affected her analysis (for instance, her discussion of Hazlitt's associationist criticism is done via the medium of P P Howe's collected works). Nor does she often attempt to delve into the personalities behind the writings which form the basis of her analysis, so for instance, she quotes almost entirely from unidentified critics in her article 'Art Reviewing in the Early Nineteenth Century Art Periodicals'.

Other scholars who have attempted to increase our understanding of nineteenth century periodical art criticism include Claude Colleer Abbott and Robyn Cooper, who have examined George Darley's contributions to The Athenaeum (76) - Abbott's work, although published back in 1928 and little known, offers some perceptive insights into English art criticism prior to Ruskin; Anne Bermingham, whose article 'Reading Constable' (77) looks at how the academic hierarchy of genres affected the way in which some critics responded to Constable's landscapes; Sam Smiles, whose illuminating article '"Splashers", "Scrawlers", and

"Plasterers": British Landscape Painting and the Language of Criticism' explores some of the derogatory adjectives used by critics to describe 'loose handling' and suggests that such adjectives represent part of that 'blurring of aesthetics and social ethics that Barrell has so valuably investigated' <78>; and Andrew Hemingway, whose article 'Academic theory versus Association Aesthetics..' <79> makes use of evidence taken from the writings of periodical critics and whose book Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteenth Century Britain <80> contains a chapter which examines some of their varied attitudes towards established art theories and contemporary art institutions, and has already been mentioned in the Introduction above, and will receive further discussion later on.

Brief mention must also be made of Kate Flint's unpublished D.Phil. thesis 'The English Critical Reaction to Contemporary Painting 1878-1910' <81>, which in spite of its title gives some consideration to earlier criticism. It is also notable for identifying and bringing together information on critics (for the period 1878-1910) in a manner similar to Appendix III below, and in doing so makes a valuable contribution to a corpus of basic factual information, which as is argued below, is essential for progress in this field.

I shall conclude this chapter by considering the methodological problems presented to those wishing to gain a deeper understanding of nineteenth century exhibition reviews. First I shall examine some of the irregular and unquantifiable qualities of this primary source which baffle systematic and logical methods of analysis. We have already seen that its sheer size presents a problem, but as yet, its exact dimensions are unknown: Vainker lists approximately 150 different periodicals and

newspapers for the period 1780 to 1830, which he claims contain information on the fine arts. They include newspapers and other periodicals published at intervals ranging from the quotidian to the annual and surviving for less than a year, or for the whole period under consideration. Until every one of these periodicals is searched and indexed, we have no way of knowing the importance each of them assigned to the fine arts, particularly the extent to which, and the regularity with which, they carried exhibition reviews, nor the exhibiting institutions which received their attention. If, for example, we take the Times' response to the Royal Academy exhibition from the beginning of the nineteenth century, we find that reviews were carried from 1800 to 1804, no reviews appeared in the next two years, a review was carried in 1807, then no more reviews until 1815 when a short one appeared, followed by another period without reviews until 1823 when the exhibition was reviewed annually until at least 1840. On the other hand, bar for a couple of years, the paper covered the British Institution from its foundation in 1806 until 1840 <82>. If, as this seems to indicate, the Times was biased against the Royal Academy, we should be aware of it when attempting to interpret its reviews. Because periodicals were erratic in their reviewing and variable in their degree of permanence, we have no two years alike in terms of which periodicals were reviewing the annual exhibitions. This lack of continuity is added to by the fact that even in the case of periodicals which were long-lived and which reviewed exhibitions regularly, the critic could vary from year to year. All these factors inevitably create problems for any analysis which hopes to consider developments over a period of time.

Now let us consider some solutions. In tackling the first problem - the large volume of material - the solution is obvious: it has to be sampled. In this respect, Ivy's book of Constable criticisms represents one type of sampling technique: that is, she has narrowed the field of analysis to one particular artist. The advantage of such a solution is that it enables a wide selection of periodicals to be taken into consideration, but its disadvantage is that it can only give a one dimensional analysis, for if we consider each individual critique, we find four variables: the exhibition in which the work was shown, the other works of art and artists that the critic included in his review, the periodical in which the review was published, and the author himself. It is hard to take into account these variables in that type of analysis which concentrates on the critical response to one artist and which covers a wide range of periodicals. In order to keep the field of our analysis within reasonable limits therefore, but also to take into account the variables just mentioned, we must base our examination on a sample of periodicals <83>.

One practically insoluble problem occurs when attempting to trace developments over a period of time - a problem encountered by this study which addresses the important question of identifying those changes (if any) in the critical criteria and vocabulary used by critics during the period under study. A random sample of unattributed reviews, each one potentially the work of a different hand or, conversely, all potentially the work of one hand, makes it difficult to distinguish between the personal stylistic characteristics of individual critics and the characteristics which are typical features of this sort of art criticism at any particular point in time. Consequently, two particular critics

have been singled out: John Taylor and Robert Hunt, each of whom enjoyed a long association with one periodical. These two critics form the subjects of the case studies presented in Chapters Three and Four. Although there are some problems of attribution in the case of John Taylor's writings, the exhibition reviews ascribed to him are characterised by a remarkable degree of uniformity and lack of change over the years which suggests a single author. Robert Hunt's writings were signed and are therefore easily attributed. They do demonstrate some changes over the years and so to a certain extent, both critics' writings can be used as one might use a control in an experiment: to provide some standard by which to judge other critical writings of the period.

The methodological problems created by the primary source under investigation are not easy to solve, and the strategies adopted by this study are by no means ideal. In addition to focussing on Robert Hunt's contributions to The Examiner (1808 to 1828) and the exhibition reviews in the Sun (1793 to 1825) ascribed to John Taylor, its analysis has been based, as far as possible, on exhibition reviews by identified critics: George Cumberland's contributions to the Morning Chronicle in the 1780s; John Scott's and Thomas Griffiths Wainewright's contributions to The London Magazine in the 1820s; and William Paulet Carey's reviews for The Literary Gazette and The New Monthly Magazine about the same time; and John Eagles' writings in Blackwoods Magazine in the 1830s. Anonymous and unidentified exhibition reviews in these periodicals have also been considered. Other motives played a part in the selection of these particular periodicals: The Examiner for ease of attribution and continuity of authorship; the Sun, in order to include a popular daily,

and to provide a political contrast to The Examiner. (It also provides a good example of some of the problems of attribution); The Literary Gazette, because of its use in providing the text of the Tabley information bat; and The New Monthly Magazine because of some evidence which suggested that Robert Hunt contributed to it. Although none of these periodicals ever reached the large circulation figures which some of the religious and political organs achieved <84>, they represent some of the leading middleclass periodicals of the day and the two newspapers the Sun and The Examiner, which were the main vehicles for the men who form the subjects of the case-studies, were known to have enjoyed times of considerable popularity during the period under study <85>.

In addition to the above periodicals from which most of the conclusions presented here are drawn, other publications with varying circulations and degrees of importance have been consulted: they include Annals of the Fine Arts, Somerset House Gazette, Review of Publications of Art - all art specialist journals; the fashionable Ackermann's Repository; the more literary Monthly Magazine and Athenaeum; the Times; and John Bull. The reliability of any generalisations based on the writings in these periodicals cannot be determined, but given the current state of knowledge concerning this primary source, our only option is to assume they present to us some characteristics which are typical of all art criticism of this period. So long as it is acknowledged that we are not presenting certainties, then this must be a justifiable way of beginning to gain some insights into the primary source which forms the basis of this study.

One of the arguments which this dissertation stresses is that the problematic nature of this material has yet to receive sufficient

attention from scholars, and that academic progress would be enhanced simply by acknowledging that such problems exist. For instance, in his review of John Barrell's The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt, Andrew Hemingway complains:

> At the beginning of his account of Hazlitt, Barrell refers to the problem of establishing 'how Hazlitt's unsigned articles on art would or could possibly have been read by his contemporaries' (p316). Considering his awareness of this problem, it is strange that he chooses to avoid it entirely by providing no discussion of the place of the articles in the continuum of discourse of the Morning Chronicle, Champion, Examiner and London Magazine, and instead concentrates on an encyclopaedia article which was largely based on them' <86>

Hemingway is correct to draw attention to Barrell's apparent avoidance of this problem, but his criticism fails to offer a methodology which would solve it <87>. If we quote from Barrell more extensively, it will be seen that within his own terms of analysis, he has indeed given consideration to some of the methodological difficulties presented by Hazlitt's writings. True, the analytical method he settles on does not take into account the broader context of Hazlitt's writings as part of that 'continuum of discourse' mentioned by Hemingway, but this is perhaps hardly surprising since Barrell is only too aware of the problematic nature of Hazlitt's writings considered solely as a discrete entity, let alone within wider terms:

> There seem to me to be two ways of attempting to produce...a coherent account of Hazlitt's opinions on painting. One would be impracticable, perhaps even in a book devoted to doing nothing else,

> for it would require lengthy and close analyses of Hazlitt's vocabulary and arguments over the whole range of his writings on art. The other... requires continually that we refer Hazlitt's pronouncements on painting back to wherever else in his writings - on metaphysics, psychology, general aesthetics - we believe we can find a ground where they can be shown to have a coherent origin. the danger of doing this...is that we produce by this method a *biographia literaria*, an account of Hazlitt's 'literary life and opinions', and of each of those opinions in the light of all the rest, which we can be sure has not much to do with how Hazlitt's unsigned writings on art would or could possibly have been read by his contemporaries. It is for these reasons that I have chosen to devote the space available to me to an account of one piece of writing on art - the longest piece, by Hazlitt's account the most representative of his opinions, at least as they were in 1816, and, if not the most widely read, the one most variously available in the years after his death <88>.

Barrell therefore openly acknowledges that his analysis of Hazlitt's one encyclopaedia article is a compromised solution to a difficult problem. Moreover, earlier in his argument, when recognising the existence of Hazlitt's numerous and sometimes ideologically conflicting periodical articles on art, he even casts doubt on 'the value... of the kind of account of Hazlitt's opinions on art which would attempt to produce coherence among them, or even a coherent explanation for their incoherence' in a similar fashion to Claude Abbott, who suggested that 'any attempt to construct a theory of aesthetics' from George Darley's periodicals articles 'would be both unwise and unnecessary'.

Nevertheless, Barrell clearly does want to extract a general theory of art from Hazlitt. That he uses Hazlitt's enclyclopaedia article to do this may be justified in so far as it offers a concise expression of a number of Hazlitt's opinions on art and possibly encapsulates the main ideas expressed in other of his writings. However, if one were to be particularly cautious, one might question Barrell's decision to analyse Hazlitt's opinions as found in a genre which was not his normal literary vehicle. Since Hazlitt more commonly wrote for periodicals than for encyclopaedias, it is possible that the encyclopaedia article gives a distorted representation of Hazlitt's ideas on art, as the use of this untypical mode of expression may have had an effect on its content. Barrell would have to survey Hazlitt's periodical writings very thoroughly to prove that the encyclopaedia article is truly representative of Hazlitt's overall viewpoint.

If we consider Hemingway's suggestion that we should give more consideration to Hazlitt's writings in the context of 'the continuum of discourse of the Morning Chronicle, Champion, Examiner and London Magazine', it will be seen that the arguments of this dissertation are generally sympathetic to the idea that any analysis should try to take more account of the historical context which saw the periodical press as Hazlitt's favoured medium and should give consideration to the original literary function of Hazlitt's writings. However, whereas this dissertation acknowledges the problems of achieving such an ambitious analysis, Hemingway's criticism of Barrell omits to mention the difficulties of devising a methodology which could satisfactorily encompass the disparate writings which make up the discourse to which he refers. An analysis restricted to just the five periodicals he mentions

would have to embrace (in addition to the writings of Hazlitt), those of Edward Dubois, Benjamin Robert Haydon, Robert Hunt, John Scott, Thomas Griffiths Wainewright - to name only those *currently identified* writers on art who used these publications as their medium and who were contemporaries of Hazlitt.

While the analyses proposed by Barrell and Hemingway differ, they both encounter a problem, given the disparate nature of the writings they hope to analyse. This is because ideally, Barrell's analysis, and (as far as one can interpret it) that proposed by Hemingway both demand a comprehensive coverage of these writings, which particularly, in Hemingway's case, who not only hopes to analyse Hazlitt's writings, but place them in the context of other periodical literature, would be an enormous undertaking. As we do have some indication of the extent of Hazlitt's writings on art, thanks to P P Howe's edition of his works, it might be possible to analyse them within Barrell's terms, (that is, to attempt to draw out of them, some overall aesthetic theory), but as Barrell suggests, we would need to devote a entire book solely to this task, if we were to perform it adequately. As Hemingway gives no indication of a methodology, it is difficult to envisage the analytical framework he has in mind which would be able to take into consideration the extensive 'continuum of discourse' of which Hazlitt's periodical writings formed a part. Whereas the aims of Barrell's analysis are clear - to attempt 'to produce...a coherent account of Hazlitt's opinions on painting' and demonstrate his argument that the discourse of civic humanism was effectively challenged by Hazlitt - it is unclear, given his criticism and the new terms of analysis he proposes, what Hemingway thinks such terms would or could hope to achieve.

In practice, faced with problem of analysing the content of the early nineteenth century periodical press, Hemingway too finds it necessary to base his analysis on a sample <89>. His analysis centres on trying to identify the overall ideological positions exhibited by these periodicals and to relate them to the opinions expressed in their fine arts columns. Some of the disadvantages of his approach are examined further below <90>, but for the time being it should be pointed out that they stem from the fact that though Hemingway is keen to distinguish various periodicals in terms of their differing ideologies, he has a tendency to over-stress the coherency and uniformity of opinion within any single periodical. Coherence is normally a quality extrinsic to periodical literature and, as we have already seen with the problems generated by Barrell's analysis, the periodical writings of one individual alone (i.e. Hazlitt) need not necessarily exhibit uniformity of opinion, let alone the content of any given periodical - usually the work of several individuals.

The crucial problem can be summarised thus: the sheer mass, as well as the diverse nature of journalistic criticism demands attention in such a way as to impede the other imperative which is, of course, to use such criticism as evidence in a more ambitious cultural history. To begin to tackle this problem, what would seem to be a more straightforward starting point (given the limitations of our current factual knowledge, especially concerning the extent of such critical writing and the identities of its authors), would be to examine these writings in terms of what they most obviously have in common, rather than trying to distinguish them along more sophisticated lines. For this reason this dissertation devotes space to examining the language of critics,

particularly exploring the degree to which critics demonstrated a common vocabulary and shared a number of general critical criteria, since perhaps the most striking feature of these writings is the extent to which they manifest a shared idiom, in spite of ideological or political differences. Starting from such a perspective should enable us to develop an appreciation of this idiom which, only as our understanding increases, will we eventually be able to perceive in terms of how it accommodated changing ideas, a changing society, and a changing artistic scene. An attempt, like that of Hemingway, to uncover or trace those more subtle oppositions and shifts in the ideological or theoretical content of these writings, would seem to be the last, rather than the initial, stage in a process of increasingly detailed analysis.

In relation to this matter, it is interesting that neither Hemingway or Barrell explore how, in spite of the fact that periodical art criticism appeared in a variety of contexts (that is, it appeared in all sorts of articles on art), much of it was was confined to a very restricted mode of expression or literary genre (i.e. the exhibition review), and that qualities peculiar to this particular genre coupled with the linguistic precedents on which it drew, may have played an important role in shaping its content. Bearing in mind the restricted scope of the exhibition review (that is, its responsive rather than prescriptive nature) and the particular immediacy, in this genre, of the problem faced by all art criticism - that of expressing essentially visual phenomena via a literary medium - it would seem to be expedient to give a high priority to considering the effects of linguistic convention and fashions in vocabulary, among the multifold influences which determined the development of the genre. This will appear a

particularly useful line of approach if we are to unravel the important question of the extent to which the critical language of reviewers functioned simply as a jargon and the extent to which it embodied a vocabulary which was intended to convey meaningful visual concepts.

The emphasis which this dissertation places on examining the effects of the expressive medium of critics, rather than hoping to extract coherent theoretical or ideological content from these disparate writings, encounters fewer of those methodological difficulties discussed above. Nevertheless, we should not lose sight of the problems of methodology which are posed by this primary source or cease to be wary of using such a wealth of material for finding evidence to suit our arguments, rather than analysing it objectively <91>.

This study stresses the caution with which we ought to approach this material, particularly the avoidance of over-ambitious analyses, which demand a more advanced level of factual knowledge than we have at present. As has been suggested, while most of the anonymous exhibition reviews remain unattributed, they have a limited value, for unless we are able to compare the writings of different identified critics, it is difficult to sort out idiosyncrasies from generalities. For this reason Chapter Two has been devoted to bringing together information on critics and Chapters Three and Four provide case-studies of two individual critics, reinforcing the general tenet of this dissertation which stresses on the importance of building up a basic corpus of knowledge to assist further progress in this field.

Chapter Two

The Critics

While one cannot overemphasise the importance of building up a corpus of basic data concerning journalistic art criticism, the significance of the current scarcity of knowledge concerning the identities of the critics themselves needs further consideration. A question not yet raised by those who have looked to periodical art criticism as a source of historical evidence, is the possibility that while the journals and newspapers which carried art criticism were very numerous (to the extent that we still cannot gauge the exact size of this primary source), the number of critics (also presently unquantifiable) may have been considerably smaller. So, although it is easy to assume that anonymous critiques published in different periodicals represent the opinions of different individuals, such an assumption may well be erroneous. Ivy's recent collection of reviews of Constable's paintings demonstrates this point well. It includes five critiques for which William Paulet Carey is the acknowledged author: The British Freeholder, I, 1 July 1820, p357, signed W.C.; The Worcester Herald, 14 June 1834, 16 August 1834, both signed Lorenzo; The Analyst, October 1834, pp197 and 202, signed William Carey; and The Analyst, August 1834, p42, July 1835, p423, showing that he made contributions to at least three different journals, two of which he worked for contemporaneously. Research undertaken for the present study suggests that four further critiques in Ivy's book should be attributed to Carey. They comprise The Literary Gazette, 10 May 1817, p249, signed W.C.; The New Monthly Magazine, no.11, 1 March 1819, p168, 1 June 1819, p451, both signed W.C. at the end of the whole

'Fine Arts' section; and The New Monthly Magazine, no.13, 1 June 1820, p717, making a total of five different journals in which his writings were published.

William Jerdan's Autobiography provides evidence which supports the first of these ascriptions by stating that Carey was the 'chief contributor' to the 'early numbers' of The Literary Gazette <1> and by mentioning that Carey was specifically responsible for the 'Fine Arts' <2>. In addition, Henry Colburn's entry in the DNB mentions that Carey contributed to 'The Fine Arts' of the Literary Gazette when it was founded in 1817. The initials W.C. also help to confirm Carey as author, as he used these initials at the end of at least one other article which has been ascribed to him with certainty. That Carey was responsible for the critiques in The New Monthly Magazine is suggested by an entry in Farington's Diary on 19 April 1820 which states: 'Wm Carey I went to this morning... He told me he writes in the Monthly Magazine [sic] and was preparing an acct. of Mr. West, the late President of the Royal Academy'. The DNB confirms Carey as the author of 'Memoirs of Benjamin West' published in the New Monthly Magazine in 1820, but Farington's Diary suggests that he was responsible for other contributions. Therefore, the initials W.C. at the end of a number of 'Fine Arts' articles in 1819 make Carey a likely candidate, in view of the fact that he definitely had connections with this periodical in the following year. In addition, Birmingham Public Library's copy of this periodical has, in faded brown ink, the initials W.C. at the end of the 1820 critique. Some knowing person obviously penned them in, possibly even Carey himself, who lived his last years in Birmingham.

Unfortunately the library does not have records of when, or from whom it acquired this volume.

These new attributions, interesting in themselves, take on further significance in the context of Ivy's book. Presented to the reader as anonymous critiques, they appear to be the opinions of a variety of individuals (one of them is even quoted adjacent to a critique identified by Ivy as penned by Carey, but, without knowing that it is by the same hand, the reader has no reason to connect it with its neighbour). Once identified as being by the same hand, these critiques take on a new meaning: by becoming the collective opinions of a particular individual, the significance of their authorship is raised, and one is more likely to begin to enquire into the reasons why the critic wrote what he did. Did he have a specialist knowledge of art? Was he acquainted with the artist in question, or were his opinions based solely on his response to the painting? And, more importantly, if the opinions expressed, and the language of these critiques display a certain uniformity, it comes as no surprise.

The more we can identify the anonymous critics who used the periodical press, the more powerful are our tools for analysis. For instance, if we can establish that there was only a relatively small selection of critics writing for a much larger number of periodicals, the extent to which their apparent anonymity really reflected secret identities among their contemporaries might be questioned. Describing the nature of journalism during the first decade of the nineteenth century , Alexander Andrews painted the following picture:

> Many of the reporters and editors of this period were 'sad dogs' indeed. The business of their profession keeping them out of their

beds half the night, they kept out the remaining half of it of their own choice; and the little hours were consumed in tavern hilarity, where, it must be admitted, they found themsleves in company with peers and gentlemen. <3>

Although more concerned with evoking the life-style of parliamentary reporters, Andrew's description, depicts a certain bonhomie within the press world (and interestingly, social contact, although perhaps not social interaction, between different classes). Art critics presumably had fewer opportunities for meeting each other, unlike the parliamentary reporters who worked together in the public gallery, (although a few art critics were parliamentary reporters as well <4>), and as there was no special 'press day' at the Royal Academy they could have blended in with the ordinary members of the public when they were viewing the exhibition. However, as will be seen in the biographical sketches given in Appendix III, many of them had received some training in art and possessed artist friends, and might therefore have had a number of contacts in artistic circles, in addition to having some place in the world of the press - and indeed, the two undoubtedly overlapped (John Taylor, who became editor of the Sun and who forms one of the subjects of Chapters Three and Four below, mentions seventeen artists and men connected with the arts with whom he claimed acquaintance <5>). Furthermore, we might cite John Britton's publication The Fine Arts of the English School, <6> as an example of how critics may have been more widely known than their anonymous or pseudonymous writings perhaps suggest. Published in 1812, it mentions that Robert Hunt's 'critical Essays on Art have long been respected' and that 'some of these may be seen in a very interesting work, of 'Outlines from West's Gallery' <7>.

However, the essays in this work have only Robert Hunt's initials R.H. to identify them, and his Fine Arts column in The Examiner also only had these initials as identification. Unless, Britton's comments are simply a case of editorial 'puffing', they suggest that Hunt's articles were known to a number of his contemporaries, not simply as innominate writings, but as the works of a particular individual. Thus in trying to gain a more complete picture of who the critics were, it may be that our appreciation of these writings will become more akin to the way in which they were read by their contemporaries.

The problem is, of course, that the process of identifying critics and attributing writings to particular individuals is fraught with difficulties. A frequently occurring one is that evidence which enables us to connect individuals with certain periodicals is more common than evidence which enables us to identify their writings precisely. And, without external evidence, attributions based on other criteria are difficult and not always very reliable. Chapter Three, Part iii below, examines the evidence for ascribing the Sun's exhibition reviews to John Taylor, and illustrates the extent to which detailed analysis and argument can become essential to making certain attributions - a lengthly process which shows that there is considerably more of this sort of work required, unless future scholars fortunately stumble across a vast quantity of helpful external evidence. In addition, it must be noted that some existing attributions which are not supported by such external evidence can often conflict or lack sufficient grounds and be generally unreliable. We can illustrate the extent to which scholars can differ in their attributions by outlining their views on a review of the 'Exhibition at the Great Room, Spring Gardens, of Mr. F W Wilkins'

Large Picture of the Battle of Hastings' signed 'T', which The London Magazine published in its February edition, 1820, pp173-174. Although the initial 'T' was used by Hazlitt to accompany many of his writings in The London Magazine including drama reviews and his 'Table Talk' essays <8>, in 1931 T Rowland Hughes <9> attributed the review of F W Wilkins' *Battle of Hastings* to John Scott, stating that despite Hazlitt's characteristic signature, the style suggested Scott. This ascription was contradicted by Josephine Bauer <10> in 1953, who put forward Hazlitt as the author. The following year Elmer Leroy Brooks <11> ascribed the review to Thomas Noon Talfourd, while the most recent ascription, that of Frank P Riga and Claude Prance <12> supports that of Josephine Bauer and offers Hazlitt on the basis of the signature 'T'. With Riga and Prance, and Bauer both in agreement, and with the signature 'T' as evidence, it appears that Hazlitt would be the most likely candidate. However, if the content of 'T's review is examined more closely, Hazlitt actually becomes less, and Scott more likely as the author.

There is general agreement <13> that John Scott penned The London Magazine's initial instalment of 'Notices of the Fine Arts' <14>, published in January. In this article, the criteria by which paintings should be judged are discussed at length. As editor of The London Magazine, John Scott wrote this article in order to inform his readership of the policy towards the arts which the magazine intended to adopt:

> We certainly entertain peculiar views on Art; and, as public exhibitions will demand from us detailed criticism, we think it fair to state the principles by which we shall estimate the works

submitted to public inspection. <15>

It would be reasonable to suggest that Scott wrote this article with the intention of playing a substantial role himself as a contributor to the 'Fine Arts' column, particularly since by this date he had already shown a considerable interest in the fine arts <16>. If 'T' was Hazlitt, it would suggest that Scott refrained from contributing to the 'Fine Arts' until the fifth number of this monthly magazine. Such surprising reticence would need no explanation if the reviews of Wilkin's picture and a subsequent review of the 'British Institution Exhibition' also signed 'T' <17> are ascribed to Scott.

Other internal evidence supports this ascription. Scott's introductory article on the Fine Arts which examines the qualities by which paintings ought to be judged, places a high importance on the feelings which paintings induce in the spectator. In arguing the importance of this particular criterion, Scott illustrated his point by referring to Bird's picture of *Chevy Chase*:

> Who can ever forget the deep pathos of the incidents pourtrayed by the lamented Mr. Bird, in his admirable picture of Chevy Chase - through the dingyness of colour and defects of drawing? If pictures were valued as they ought to be, for the feelings they excited, these, being common to our nature, could not be misled by the dogmatism of public critics. <18>

Interest in Bird may have been generated by his recent death (in November 1819) - his picture of *Chevy Chase* having enjoyed popularity when it had been exhibited at the British Institution in 1812. Nevertheless, it does seem more than coincidental that the picture is mentioned again, the following month in 'T's review of Wilkins' *Battle*

of Hastings and that ideas similar to those expressed by Scott in his introductory article are put forward:

> Battles excite few feelings which are not abhorant from the best part of nature; nor can we except any but those of a patriot, excited by the successes of his country. Here, however, the reverse occur. Many eminent men, have, it is true, employed their talents on such scenes; but that is because the mere jumble of men, and horses, and arms, arranged according to certain rules in art, make up a display, easily attained. Like the poet's, however, the painter's power is greatest in the 'Home of the Heart'; and certainly there are incidents connected with battles by which our sympathies may be powerfully excited. Such were introduced into Bird's Chevy Chase; and the death of Harold in the present picture, who falls struggling for the independence of his country, whilst fighting as a foot soldier, is of this nature. <19>

While these similarities between Scott's initial article on the Fine Arts and 'T's review of Wilkins' *Battle of Hastings* offer some evidence for ascribing the review to Scott, certain opinions expressed in 'T's review of the British Institution present further evidence for connecting 'T' with Scott. The British Institution review makes the following remarks about John Martin's painting *Macbeth on the Blasted Heath - the Witches Disappearing* (Pl.6):

> It is a picture of great merit and inferior only by comparison with the artist's other works. Having a high reputation of his genius we wish that he would confine his efforts to subjects in which his imagination might take unbounded flight. Jerico and Babylon were of this class. <20>

Thus reviewer 'T' evidently entertained favourable opinions of Martin's works, and moreover expressed an admiration which was based on Martin's skills as an imaginative painter: it was his ability to allow his imagination to 'take unbounded flight' which impressed reviewer 'T'. Such views are contrary to the opinions expressed by Hazlitt in his known writings concerning Martin's works. He criticised Martin's paintings as exaggerations which, precisely because they were too far removed from nature, failed to excite the imagination. Nor did Hazlitt ever suggest a 'high admiration' for Martin's pictures, only once grudgingly acknowledging that 'in some things' they were 'very meritorious' <21>. Hazlitt's other known opinions contradict those of reviewer 'T':

> Said Northcote, there is some merit in finding out a new trick. I [Hazlitt] ventured to hint, that the receipt for his [Martin's] was, cloud upon mountains, and mountains upon clouds - that there was number and quantity, but neither form nor colour. He appeared to me an instance of a total want of imagination... <22>

> He [Martin] reckons that if one range of lofty square hills is good, another range above that with clouds between must be better. He thus wearies the imagination, instead of exciting it. We see no end of the monotony of this sort of reduplication of the same object. We were satisfied before, but it seems the painter was not, and we naturally sympathise with him. This craving after quantity is a morbid affection. A landscape is not an architectural elevation. You may build a house as high as you can lift up stones with pulleys and levers, but you cannot raise mountains into the sky merely with

a pencil. They lose probability and effect by striving at too much, and, with their ceaseless throes, oppress the imagination of the spectator, and bury the artist's fame under them. <23>

It will be seen then, that the contradictory opinions as to the identity of 'T' make an interesting study of how current ascriptions can be unreliable and of how much more work is needed in order to match writings with particular individuals with some degree of certainty. The most favoured ascription (and incidently the only published one) puts forward Hazlitt as the author of 'T's review of Wilkins' *Battle of Hastings*, yet a more detailed analysis of the internal evidence comes down in favour of the opinion that Scott wrote this review - an opinion expressed by Hughes back in 1931.

It has been remarked upon in Chapter One how historical studies, until fairly recently, had been prone to give undue attention to particular individuals. The reaction against this has led to a tendency to explore thematic concepts or broader issues and to interpret the past not in terms of individual behaviour, but in terms of more general developments in society and culture. There can be no doubt that the current fashion has enhanced historical scholarship generally, but unfortunately in the more specific field of art history this present emphasis may be detrimental to furthering our understanding of exhibition reviews if it means that the personalities behind these mostly anonymous writings are neglected. (It is perhaps no coincidence that in the conflicting attributions discussed above, it is Hughes' attribution of 1931 which would seem to be more reliable than the more recent suppositions). As this dissertation strongly argues that our historical understanding of reviews is severely limited whilst they

remain unattributed and suggests that we need to delve into the backgrounds of critics more, Appendix III has been compiled in order to bring together information on some of the individuals identified so far and where possible attach known authors with the periodical or periodicals for which they wrote and the approximate dates of their connection. In doing this, Appendix III contributes to the first stages of building up a body of factual information which ought to exist to provide a means for distinguishing the writings of different anonymous critics and ultimately create a powerful tool to assist any future research which hopes to analyse the reception of British art in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century periodical press. The discussion which follows draws conclusions from the information provided in Appendix III and makes some generalisations concerning the profession of art critic prior to 1843.

The Profession of Art Critic before Ruskin

Appendix III is prefaced by an attempt to distinguish 'professional' art critics from other users of the periodical press, but as the rather unsatisfactory inverted commas suggest, the word 'professional' is not a wholly appropriate term for describing the thirty-one art critics whose careers form the basis of this analysis. A thirty-second individual, Haydon, although he finds a place in the inventory given in Appendix III, is omitted from this analysis since he used the press almost entirely to promote himself and his own opinions rather than acting as an arbiter between exhibiting artists and the public, and therefore can

hardly be considered as a representative of those who entered the 'profession' of art critic. But if Haydon is to be excluded from the following analysis, we might question the inclusion of some other individuals. On what grounds do John Hoppner and Martin Archer Shee, for instance, deserve inclusion, for both these writers indulged in the underhand practice of reviewing their own exhibits favourably? My justification for including them is that it is difficult to decide at present whether the primary function of their writings was actually self-promotion or genuine criticism (it seems likely that as they were both students, their motivation may have been financial as much as strategic): if they happened to make use of the opportunity to put in a good word for themselves during the course of their reviews, it does not necessarily mean that their comments on other artists were based on anything other than impartial objective criticism. Of course, we are on difficult ground here, for other art critics listed in Appendix III, such Henry Bate Dudley, would not be described as impartial, and the whole notion of impartiality brings up questions which, although according to some definitions may indicate certain levels of 'professionalism', for our present purposes are too complicated to consider here. Impartiality is probably not the issue which should be concerning us in our attempt to define 'professional', but rather whether the individual in question can be considered an employee of the periodical in question (excepting the more complicated cases when the individual was its proprietor cum editor, and the early stages of reviewing when all reviews were sent in by voluntary correspondents) and although evidence is not always clear on this point, it is certainly true that along these lines it would be more fair to say that Haydon

employed the press rather than vice versa. If it is accepted that, as far as we can tell at present, Haydon's relationship with the press was different from the other individuals whose biographical details are given in Appendix III, what do we have which ties the remaining individuals together?

As the biographical sketches indicate, art criticism as a profession can hardly be said to have existed before 1843 for not one of the individuals included in Appendix III was employed solely in this occupation. Even Robert Hunt who enjoyed the most stable career as a writer on art probably had a second occupation as an artist, and John Taylor who seems likely to have been the Sun's art critic for a substantial period, acted in other capacities for this newspaper (see Chapter Three below). The scarcity of individuals who enjoyed a regular and permanent position as the art critic for any one particular periodical is easy to explain: the non-specialist periodicals were mainly only interested in reviewing the annual exhibition of the Royal Academy, which meant that unless an art critic fulfilled another function on the periodical's staff, he was superfluous throughout most of the year. On the other hand, the specialist magazines which would have provided the opportunity for work all year round, were generally rather short-lived, (a fact noted by William Carey in his Memoirs of Lord de Tabley <24>). For example, Annals of the Fine Arts ran for only four years and The Artist, Review of Publications of Art, Magazine of the Fine Arts, Somerset House Gazette, all lasted approximately a year <25>. The fact that being an art critic could not be a full time occupation is reflected in all the careers outlined in Appendix III, but

if we try to draw some other generalisations, patterns do begin to emerge.

Firstly, the number of critics who were also artists is high: at least fifteen exhibited at the Royal Academy at some point in their lives - Beazley, Cumberland, Dagley, Eagles, Elmes, Hazlitt, Hoare, Hoppner, Hunt, Landseer, Pyne, Shee, Wainewright, Watts, and Williams. A further two received some training in the visual arts: Carey and Thackeray. Christopher Kent <26> who collected information on approximately eighty art critics for the period 1830-1914, found that at least 39% of them were 'trained artists', and although he did not clearly define what he meant by this, it is reasonable to interpret his figure as representing a significant decrease in the number of artist/critics as the nineteenth century wore on. Of the men listed in Appendix III, a significant group of non-artists comprises writers for The Athenaeum (Chorley, Cunningham, Darley, Dilke, and Reynolds) whose identities have been uncovered by scholars thanks to the chance survival of a marked file of this journal. As The Athenaeum was founded towards the end of the period, in 1828, and most of these writers were working for it in the 1830s, they offer further evidence to suggest that a training in art was becoming less usual by about the third decade of the ninteenth century. This change may be linked to changes in art, for the growing popularity of genre scenes perhaps helped to encourage a shift from that type of critical commentary which discussed those technical features which were derived from the rules of academic theory, such as colouring, composition, drawing and so on (discussed further in Chapters Four and Five), to that which dwelt largely on narrative content - the latter requiring predominantly well-developed literary skills and the

ability to convey a good story, the former requiring at least an elementary knowledge of painting theory and practice.

The notion that only artists themselves are sufficiently qualified to judge art is undoubtedly a perennial issue. During the period under study, advocates on both sides of this issue voiced their opinions: already quoted (see p47 above), John Scott's opinion of 1820, put forward the democratic argument that we are all qualified to judge art since paintings ought to be valued 'for the feelings they excited' (regardless even of technical defects) and Hazlitt too, in his essay 'On Judging of Pictures' <27> expressed similar views: 'If a picture be admired by none but painters, I think it a strong presumption that the picture is bad'. The other court was represented by Hoare's periodical The Artist (1809) which allowed only professional artists as contributors and Haydon's famous essay in opposition to Payne Knight: 'On the Judgement of Connoisseurs being preferred to that of Professional Men' <28>. When the debate became manifest in the public trial between Ruskin <29> and Whistler in 1878 it included the question of how the amount of labour expended on a painting might be related to its value - a notion which surely must have been fostered by genre scenes where there is a very evident correlation between the viewer's enjoyment and therefore 'value for money', and the time which the artist has spent on minute and entertaining detail. Whistler's defence that his picture represented not simply the work of two days but 'the knowledge of a life time' <30> encapsulated the sentiments of the 'Art for Art's Sake' doctrine with which he is connected and which in England is generally associated with the later part of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, such feelings had been foreshadowed by Haydon in 1831:

> After working with intense anxiety to keep my engagement with Kearsey, and having succeeded, to my conviction, in producing a rapid and finished sketch with character, colour, handling, and chiaroscuro, I took it down, expecting praise. When he saw it, with that air of insolence money gives city people, he said, 'I suppose this was done in three-quarters of an hour?' What was that to the purpose? Were there not all the requisites of Art, and all the experience of my life? There were <31>.

We might distinguish Haydon's sentiments from Whistler's though, and place them in an earlier period owing to his belief in quite clearly defined 'requisites of Art': he was concerned that his sketch was 'finished' and that it had 'character', 'colour', 'handling', and 'chiaroscuro' - the sort of technical qualities which as an artist he felt best qualified to judge <32>.

If we find that a large proportion of the art critics working before 1843 were practising artists or had some training in art it would seem to indicate that a technical knowledge of art was generally a prerequisite to becoming an art critic at this time. However, it must be acknowledged that for some of these individuals, art was so much more the important part of their careers, they might be properly classed as professional artists, but amateur critics. They comprise the architects Beazley and Elmes, the painters Hoppner and Shee, and the engraver Landseer. Two of them, Hoppner and Shee, seem to have had only brief flirtations with being journalist art critics and, as has been suggested, since both were students at the time, they may have been influenced by financial motives (it seems also that the periodical for which both of them worked, the Morning Post, was perhaps deliberately

pursuing a policy of using young artists to write its exhibition reviews at the time). Two others, Elmes and Landseer, as founders and editors of magazines, might deserve higher status than that of 'amateur' in the field of journalism, but since it would seem that neither of them had any financial necesssity for doing so (both were very successful in their artistic careers) the epithet 'amateur' is perhaps still appropriate. With the absence of financial necessity, they both might be suspected of having ulterior motives for becoming involved in the world of the press and indeed the anti-Royal Academy and pro-Haydon sentiments of Elmes' Annals of the Fine Arts and Landseer's grievance against the Royal Academy's ruling which prevented engravers becoming full members, certainly suggest this. Nevertheless, although some of the articles in Annals of the Fine Arts or in Landseer's Review of Publications of Art may have been biased, the fact these periodicals contained exhibition reviews (still unattributed, but most probably penned by the editors) and were not given over solely to promoting these causes prevent these authors from being placed along with Haydon in the category of exploiters of the periodical press.

As well as those critics who were primarily artists, we have a category which comprises those individuals for whom writing and painting seem to be more or less equally important: Dagley, Hunt, Wainewright, and Watts. Hunt is perhaps a slightly doubtful member of this group for he exhibited rather sporadically and there is no evidence that he derived much income from painting except in his early career as a book illustrator. Dagley, however, exhibited extensively at the Royal Academy and Jerdan's description of him as 'an artist' <33> surely indicates that he made a living this way. Wainewright and Watts must

have been held in considerable esteem by their contemporaries for the former was a candidate for an Associateship at the Royal Academy and the latter became miniature painter to Princess Charlotte. Nevertheless, none of these artist/critics was sufficiently successful in his artistic career to become wholly dependent on it as his sole occupation.

Two other individuals ought to be mentioned at this point for having occupations related to the visual arts: Carey and Stanley who were both art dealers. The degree to which Stanley relied on writing for an income is difficult to determine at present. For Carey though, it would seem that writing about art was more of a luxury than a necessity: since his pamphlets and books were available free, it suggests that he either had friends in the publishing world, friends who helped finance his publications or enough money himself to pay for them to be printed. Most of his writing for the periodical press was also probably done without payment for in one of his publications he described himself as having been a 'literary volunteer' in the 'medium of the press' <34>.

An important and quite large category of critics consists of men who had respectable and rather conventional middle class occupations. They include three clergymen: Dibdin, Dudley, and Eagles (and a fourth who gave up his training, Hazlitt); Three lawyers: Dubois, Reynolds and Thackeray (the latter eventually abandoning his conventional career); and two civil servants: Dilke and Scott (the latter again abandoning his secure job fairly early on in his career, the former eventually giving up after thirty years in which he 'tolerated' his profession). Although some of these men became sufficiently successful as writers to be able to give up their more conventional occupations, the fact that a considerable proportion held on to their steady occupations reinforces

the evidence which suggests that very few art critics of this period could make a full time occupation out of writing about art. It also perhaps says something for the lack of respectability which journalism had at this time (a point discussed later in this chapter).

Having seen that a large number of the critics before 1843 were involved in another occupation, it should be noted that within their writing or journalistic activities several of them embraced subject areas in addition to the visual arts. At least eight (and probably considerably more) wrote drama criticism at some point in their careers: Carey, Chorley, Darley, Dilke, Dubois, Hazlitt, Jerdan and Taylor. That many art critics also acted as drama critics is hardly surprising given the observation above that being an exhibition reviewer tended to be a seasonal occupation <35>. Drama reviewers had employment all year round and some of the skills that they needed were perhaps similar to those of exhibition reviewers: it was certainly convenient for periodicals to have someone on their staff who could act as both. A detailed examination of the relationships between art reviewing and drama reviewing is somewhat outside the scope of the present study, but future research may be able to determine whether developments in the former were paralleled by developments in the latter. For the time being, it is pertinent to point out a couple of important connections between the two forms of reviewing. Firstly, it should be noted that while nowadays we would tend to describe the activities of essentially interpretative artists (such as actors or musicians) as 'performances', in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, it was common not only for drama (and concert) reviewers to use this terminology, but for exhibition reviewers to describe art objects thus <36>. Such a use of

language surely had implications concerning the type of critical processes to which art exhibits were subjected. If a work of art is perceived primarily in terms of a 'performance' its value as a object in its own right is understated and its significance as a vehicle for expressing the skills (or other attributes) of the artist is emphasised. This was indeed, entirely consistent with the transformation of the rules of academic theory into criteria of judgement (a point which will be returned to in Chapters Four and Five). As academic theory developed to establish painting as a liberal art, it placed much importance on distinguishing those skills which were merely mechanical from those which were intellectual, in order to argue that the latter were essential to the painter's art. Although, as the nineteenth century progressed, the rationale of academic theory became increasingly inappropriate to the social and political structures of industrialised Britain, arguments which sought to differentiate between painting and other mechanical trades were still being voiced - as Elmes' General and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Fine Arts (1826) took pains to explain, under its entry for 'artist':

> An artist is one who professes or practises a liberal art; an artisan, one who follows or exercises a mechanical trade. The mason, the bricklayer, the carpenter, the smith, the house painter, the paper hanger, the room decorator, and such like, are artisans...The builder should not be called an architect, nor should the sign painter, the figure caster, or plasterer, the chair sculptor, commonly called cabinet maker, the paper hanger and wall decorator be called artists. Their proper appellation, artisan or tradesman, and the certain profit attendant on all their labours are sufficient

for their exertions; because their employment does not consist in the exercise of the higher faculties of the mind' <37>.

It was natural that paintings and sculptures should be described as 'performances' therefore, particularly in the context of an exhibition, because within the terms provided by academic theory, they represented the public display of the intellectual abilities (and mechanical skills) of artists, rather than objects which functioned (to entertain, to please etc.) independently of their makers. Furthermore, since the proper aim of the painter was history painting, his role was indeed akin to that of the interpretative artist, or a performer, in so far as his task was to convey already existing stories and events, (albeit with a necessary inventiveness), rather than to create new stories. It cannot be without significance that many art critics perceived their job primarily in terms of pointing out the 'merits' and 'defects' of 'performances' when their remarks were published within a literary context which placed them near to reviews of other sorts of performances (theatrical and musical), where the performer, not just the performance was an object of public spectacle. Nor should the emphasis which such a critical approach placed on criticising the artist (rather than merely the work of art) be underestimated, for as Sam Smiles has pointed out, some of the terminology which hostile critics used to describe loose handling, certainly made it hard to distinguish whether their comments were intended to convey only painterly qualities or whether they were meant actually to imply something about the behaviour or morality of the artist himself <38>.

Secondly, of immense significance, but again an enormous topic, is the use of the language of art criticism in theatrical reviews

themselves: the Morning Chronicle's drama critic in the 1780s for instance, showed a particular fondness for employing the terminolgy of art criticism. Was this simply a reflection of its fashionableness (which in itself is important)? Should it be interpreted as an fundamental connection between the two types of reviewing? Does it confirm the supposition that a large proportion of reviewers fulfilled the dual role of both drama and art critic? - problems which at present must be left to future research to solve. Although posing more questions than they answer, it would be a pity however, to proceed to another topic without illustrating a couple of striking incidences of the use of art critical language in the context of drama reviewing. For example, in his review of Macklin's comedy The Man of the World at Covent Garden Theatre, the Morning Chronicle's reviewer got so carried away by the analogy that it is difficult not to believe that we are really reading about a painting, rather than a play:

> A Man of the World [is] a being bent solely on promoting his own interest and ambition, without suffering himself to be once diverted from the pursuit, by the sudden and momentary impulse of integrity, philanthropy, morality, religion, or any kind of those fine passions and impressions, which dignify mankind, and render them worthy of their maker. In exhibiting a picture of this sort, the painter must hold a firm pencil, and he must necessarily give the features a powerful glow of colouring. Mr. Macklin has succeeded uncommonly well in designing the portrait of Sir Pertinax MacSycophant, and his tints are warm and strong. Perhaps the rest of the groupe (sic) which make up the picture, are rather too much in the back of the canvas: he has taken care, however, to preserve an interest and connexion,

and to form a contrast. <39>

The Morning Chronicle's drama reviewer applied the language of art reviewing not only to the plays themselves, but also to the acting. His description of one of the actors in Measure for Measure, at Covent Garden, launches into analogy without preparation, like the previous example:

> ....Mr. Wroughton presented Claudio, with all that glow of colouring, peculiar to the painter possessed of a mind, whose pictures breathe an air of originality, which essentially distinguishes them from those of the mere imitation of place, person, and situation. <40>

Even into the nineteenth century, drama reviewers were still apt to turn to the vocabulary of art criticism. Leigh Hunt occasionally did so in his theatrical reviews for The Examiner. For example:

> Mr. Young [the actor]... is more harmonious in his colouring, more skilful in the dispositions of his lights and shades; but still he wants the occasional touches of both, and is altogether too sombrous. <41>

And, to be sure, if one cared to search for it, it would undoubtedly be possible to locate a similar example, where in the adjacent column, Leigh's brother, Robert, the art critic, could be found discussing the 'performances' at the annual Royal Academy exhibition.

Before leaving this brief comment on the connections between drama and art reviewing, one final point needs to be mentioned: that five of the critics listed in Appendix III were sufficiently interested in the stage to have written plays: Beazley, Hoare, Mayhew, Shee, and Taylor.

Turning to a different literary form, Appendix III reveals that ten of the critics identified so far turned their hands to writing poetry, achieving varying degrees of acclaim: Dagley, Darley, Dibdin, Dubois, Jerdan, Reynolds, Shee, Stanley, Taylor and Williams.

If this figure seems quite large (and it might be even bigger) it is suggested here that we should read it simply as a demonstration of the popularity of the medium of verse at this time, rather than to extract from it any deeper significance. True, the concept of *ut pictura poesis* - poetry and painting as sister arts - played a fundamental part in painting theory until it was seriously challenged by Lessing's Laocoon <42> and it would be remiss not to comment on it in this context: for instance, it should be pointed out that the periodical press was a medium through which the notion of *ut pictura poesis* was debated during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries <43> and it may be that those critics who were also poets were especially conscious of the theories which linked poetry and painting. On the other hand, in explaining the large proportion of critics who wrote verse, what is perhaps more important is the fact that poetry appears to have been an essential ingredient of many periodical publications, some regularly reserving copious space for 'original poetry' <44>. Critics who were on the permanent staff of such periodicals, perhaps turned to versification because there was a need to fill this space. Or, even more likely, writing verse was a popular pastime with everyone, it was just that those who already had connections with the periodical press were more likely to get their poems published. The desirability of including poetry as part of the menu of a successful periodical was such, that even an art specialist magazine like Annals of the Fine Arts could be

found publishing poems, and quite notable ones at that: Keats' *Ode to a Nightingale* and *Ode on a Grecian Urn* were published for the first time in this journal <45>.

While many of the art critics were working in other literary forms, some were employed in the quintessential occupation of journalism: parliamentary reporting. Hazlitt and Jerdan began their careers in this way and Watts was a parliamentary reporter throughout nearly all his adult life, curiously combining this means of earning a living with miniature painting. His combination of occupations however, seems only mildly bizarre when compared with Mayhew who conjures up a rather comical image working on The Horse's Mouth, Shewing the Age by the Teeth in the morning and going of to view and make his notes on the Royal Academy Exhibition in the afternoon. Nevertheless, as Kent's list of music, drama and art critics reveals, critics in the Victorian age were equally, if not more diverse, for in his inventory 'a fashionable (and adulterous) clergyman, a brothel keeper, the son of a royal duke, and a leading military analyst rub shoulders' <46>. Such diversity perhaps should not surprise us too much, however, for in spite of the fact that many of the critics listed in Appendix III seem to have received some training in art, the qualifications for becoming a periodical art critic have always been as they are today: no more specific than the ability to put pen to paper.

Turning finally to examine the backgrounds of the critics it will be seen that Appendix III reveals that they tended to have fathers who were in middleclass professions. The list of fathers include at least three clergymen, three merchants, three civil servants, two captains in the Navy, one school master, and six skilled tradesmen. The tradesmen

include perhaps the lowliest occupations, for Scott's and Pyne's fathers are described respectively as 'upholsterer' and 'leather seller' in the DNB, neither of which convey particularly high social standing. On the other hand, Scott was sent to a grammar school and went on to university so his social background can hardly be compared with the thousands of illiterate working class families who were living in Britain at this time. In fact at least four other critics (Darley, Dibdin, Dudley, and Thackeray) went to university even though they did not all graduate and the social backgrounds of all the critics must of course indicate a level of literacy which excludes each one of them from being termed anything lower on the social scale than middleclass. It is important to keep this in mind throughout the following examination of how the social status of journalists was perceived by contemporaries during the first few decades of the nineteenth century.

In general, evidence concerning the status of journalists during this period shows that either society tended to view their occupation with disrespect or that journalists felt this to be so. Being a contributor to a periodical was a precarious way of earning a living and the sheer instability of the occupation undoubtedly encouraged society to assume that it attracted characters who were unconventional and perhaps a little reckless. Although Arthur Aspinall <47> has noted the growing respectability of journalism during the first half of the nineteenth century, it is easy to find evidence of the low regard with which journalists were sometimes held. Bulwer-Lytton for instance, in 1833, described Sunday paper journalists as 'broken-down sharpers ci-devant markers at gambling houses and the very worst description of uneducated blackguards' <48> and two years earlier Thomas Carlyle had thought that

'magazine work' was 'below street sweeping as a trade' <49>. In 1835 a journalist in the London Review noted: 'That those who are regularly connected with the Newspaper Press are for the most part excluded from what is, in the widest extension of the term, called good society; or that, if admitted into good company, they are very rarely admitted on a footing of equality, is a lamentable truth familiar to everybody who has any knowledge of the world' <50> and a recent scholar has concluded that 'O'Boyle <51> was over-optimistic when she claimed that, by the middle of the nineteenth century, "journalism came close to attaining full development as a profession"' <52>. On the other hand although journalism did not enjoy much respect, the very fact that the status of journalist was ever a point of discussion is evidence that those who entered this profession were sufficiently confident in their own worth to raise complaints. A concern with social standing certainly suggests the sort of grudge held by the literate middle-classes at a time when the working-classes were more concerned with Parliamentary Reform and decent wages. As has been noted, the degree of literacy which was a prerequisite for entering journalism placed any member of this profession in the middleclasses. An awareness of the high level to which most journalists were educated was shown by Sheridan as early as 1810 when he remarked in the House of Commons that 'Of about twenty-three gentlemen who were now employed reporting parliamentary debates for the newspapers, no less than eighteen were men regularly educated at the universities of Oxford or Cambridge, Edinburgh or Dublin; most of them graduates at those universities, and several of them had gained prizes and other distinctions there by their literary attainments' <53>. Although, Andrews (already quoted) recorded the fact that journalists

and men of high social rank formed noctural tavern society though the London Review's journalist's comments would suggest that they never met on equal terms. Even so, a few editors received salaries which would have enabled them to buy respectable properties and to have moved among polite circles. When Thomas Barnes took over full editorial control of The Times in 1813 his salary was £1000 a year and a few years later Lockhart was offered a salary of £1500 a year to edit The Representative <54>. Heriot's salary for editing the Sun was claimed to be an amazingly high figure: something between £3000 and £5000 in 1803 (see below p112).

If contributors to the periodical press in general had difficulty gaining respect, the Royal Academy was slow to recognise the needs of art critics in particular. The idea of giving free admission to members of the press was put forward in 1821 <55>, and in 1850 eventually acted upon, when 'cards of invitation were issued to metropolitan journals' <56>, but it was only in 1871 that the Academy introduced a special viewing day for members of the press <57>. Hence critics who lacked the necessary contacts to get into the private view had often to refrain from commenting in detail on the most popular pictures in the annual exhibition until some time after the opening, when the crowds had thinned a little and they could get a better view.

It would perhaps be a mistake to generalise on the social position of art critics during the earlier years of the nineteenth century, for although their status must have been similar to other journalists, the degree to which they might be considered 'professionals' in this field is very variable, (as has been noted): since in some cases, writing about art may have been little more than a hobby, rather than a serious

occupation, it would be wrong to gauge the social status of such individuals in terms of what contemporaries had to say about those whose primary occupation was writing for periodicals. However, as we have suggested, it seems that by about the third decade of the nineteenth century, it was becoming less common for art critics to have been trained in art. This suggests the following: that because exhibition reviews were becoming an essential part of most newpapers, and because newspapers themselves were becoming larger concerns employing more members of staff <58>, editors were gradually less inclined to use occasional writers to act as art critics, but instead preferred to assign the task to a permanent member of staff (often a junior member of staff, who could be more easily spared for such a task). Therefore, it became more usual to become an art critic via journalism, rather than via an initial interest in the fine arts. That this was perceived to be the situation, is shown by an article published in The New Monthly Magazine in 1829. The article, which takes the form of a conversation, has one of the participants commenting on the inability of newspapers to appreciate the works of Turner. The other replies:

> The best proof of their merit, my friend. I wonder the editors of newspapers do not employ men of knowledge in the Fine Arts for reporters, instead of your raw Irish or Scotsmen, who report Parliamentary debates with singular skill, but have not the slightest qualification for criticising works of art, which require a mature judgement <59>.

He goes on to remark, how Turner's *Polyphemus* could not be appreciated by such writers, for, as he explained, although *he* had seen 'sunsets in Devonshire almost as glorious', what a 'cockney cannot see from Fleet-

Street or Kentish Town he cannot believe to exist in nature'. The social backgrounds of journalist critics therefore, were perceived even by contemporaries as an important factor in determining the quality and depth of periodical art criticism.

As a conclusion to this enquiry into the backgrounds of some of the critics of the period, it might be noted that most of the individuals identified so far, fall into four main categories, which can be summarised thus: men who became involved in the periodical press, but who were primarily artists; men who were steadily employed in some middle class occupation and who wrote about art without apparently having any financial incentive; men who combined writing for a living with some other occupation, particularly art, and for whom both occupations seemed to have had equal importance; and men who eventually became able to rely on writing as their primary source of income, but who had initially pursued some other occupation. Towards the end of the period it seems that an increasing number of critics commenced their careers as journalists.

Finally, the absence of women in the inventory provided in Appendix III deserves some discussion. In recent years, work has been undertaken which has attempted to explain the absence, or at least scarcity, of women in many historical studies. While in some cases it might be shown to simply reflect historical actuality, (women did not take part in some functions of past society), in others it has been the result of the accidental neglect or prejudices of historians. On a more complex level, it has been argued that the discipline of history itself has embodied certain preconceived notions as to the proper subjects for its study, and that such preconceptions have moulded our perception of the

past and put undue emphasis on those aspects which have been concerned with masculine activity. The scope of this thesis does not permit a detailed analysis of these arguments, which deserve more space than can be assigned to them in the present context, and which have become a specialist field in their own right. However, a brief examination is put forward of the extent to which we can determine whether the absence women in Appendix III indicates a genuine absence of female art critics during the period in question.

One of the points which has to be bornein mind, is that the individuals identified and listed in this study answer criteria specifically designed to try to identify exhibition reviewers. These criteria have excluded writers on art for whom there is no evidence to suggest that they ever wrote exhibition reviews for periodicals. However, there is always a possibility that future evidence will show that some of these more general writers on art were also exhibition reviewers. Given that the list in Appendix III is not comprehensive and that the proportion of female to male writers generally, was probably much smaller, it is worth noting that a few women writers on art prior to 1843 are known, even though none so far has been identified as an exhibition reviewer. Clare Richter Sherman and Adele Holcomb's book Women as Interpreters of the Visual Arts <60> lists Mariana Starke whose Travels in Italy published in 1802 included descriptions of works of art, Maria Dundas Graham (later Lady Callcott) who wrote the first monograph in English on Nicholas Poussin in 1835 and Sydney Owenson (later Lady Morgan) who wrote The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa in 1824. Anna Jameson who is also considered in their book deserves particular mention since it is known that she contributed to the

periodical press. However, she only began to specialise in writing about art in 1842 and does not find a place in the above list as her contributions to periodicals began after this date. Another woman writer mentioned by Sherman and Holcomb is of interest, but owing to her nationality cannot form part of our analysis: had she not been born in Massachusetts, Margaret Fuller might have found a place in the list above for publishing, in July 1840, A Record of Impressions Produced by the Exhibition of Mr. Allston's Pictures in the Summer of 1839. In 1844 she became a journalist and critic for the New York Tribune and her contributions to this newspaper were published in a collected form in 1846 under the title Papers on Literature and Art.

Given that there were a number of women writers on art during this period, it is probably wrong to assume that the absence of women in Appendix III indicates a total absence of women exhibition reviewers in Britain prior to 1843. That some of the men included here, such as Thackeray or Martin Archer Shee, have found a place because scholarly attention has already singled them out is a serious point to consider. Whether this reflects the bias of scholars towards masculine subjects remains debatable, but what is important, is that attention has been directed towards them for reasons other than their activities as art critics. This may mean that until research in this field becomes sufficiently developed to rely less on secondary sources, there may well be a tendency to overlook female exhibition reviewers.

Nevertheless, it can be stated that female contributors to the periodical press in general, were definitely a phenomenon before 1843, although a glance at some of the contributors identified in the Wellesley Index shows them to have been considerably outnumbered by men

<61>. During the course of researching this dissertation only one reference to a British female art critic who contributed to the periodical press has been found: Sarah Flower, who wrote for The Monthly Repository <62> and whose articles 'A National Gallery' (a description of a visit to the Louvre) and 'The Luxembourg' were published in this journal in 1833 and 1834 respectively. However, there is no evidence which suggests that she was ever an exhibition reviewer.

Although women during the first few decades of the nineteenth century were more likely to furnish periodicals with poems or the sorts of article which could be written at home, if art criticism as a feminine occupation had any social stigma attached to it, it did have one advantage over many other occupations where the presence of women might have been frowned upon by society: women critics could carry out their occupation without being noticed. All depictions of the Royal Academy Exhibition from the earliest records onwards show not only a good proportion of women visitors, but also quite a large number of people carrying exhibition catalogues, which, of course, had to be purchased in order to gain entry, but which could also act as a good camouflage for anyone wishing to make notes <63>. As the nineteenth century progressed and periodical literature increased in volume, not only were there many more critics generally, evidence suggests that women critics enjoyed the same status as men. One reviewer in 1892 even happened to notice that 'the lady critics... at the press view numbered at mid-day fifteen to five men' <64>. Although this should not be taken to indicate that women critics were outnumbering their male counterparts at this time, for the reviewer was certainly commenting on an exceptional, rather than a regular occurance, it does show that women critics felt no need to

keep their occupation a secret, since had they wished, they could have waited until after the press view, and pursued their task incognito, as ordinary members of the public.

Chapter Three

The Case Studies

This chapter examines two critics, Robert Hunt and John Taylor, and the two periodicals with which they were primarily connected, The Examiner and the Sun. Its purpose is to focus on the particular, rather than the general: to provide case studies which will contribute to building up a broader picture of critics, periodicals and periodical art criticism during the period under study. The advantage of these case studies in terms of methodology, is that they enable the primary source which forms the focus of this study to be approached in a multi-dimensional way. In addition, by circumscribing the field of study along these particular lines they avoid the pitfalls of more ambitious analyses which, in attempting a comprehensive view of this material, might fail to acknowledge the magnitude of the primary source involved. While such analyses risk drawing over-generalised conclusions from a relatively small proportion of evidence taken at random from a variety of anonymous writings and a variety of periodicals, the case study, by being selective prior to analysis, rather than during it, reduces the danger of focussing only on that evidence which suits a particular line of argument, but allows for a more objective approach.

By concentrating on specific cases, the present chapter illuminates a couple of the important issues already raised in this dissertation. Firstly, it shows the extent to which our present knowledge of the identities of different critics can vary, as well as the differing degrees to which available evidence can assist in attribution: in the case of John Taylor a lengthy consideration of the evidence for

ascribing the Sun's exhibition reviews to him, illustrates some of the problems which accompany the process of attribution. Robert Hunt's writings for The Examiner provide a useful complement to this, being unproblematic in terms of attribution since they were nearly always signed with his initials. Secondly, brief historical outlines of the periodicals in which Taylor's and Hunt's writings were published, illustrate the diversity of contexts in which we might find this type of art criticism. Again, the two case studies are complementary: the Tory and Treasury supported Sun, contrasted with an organ of the Liberal intelligentsia, The Examiner. With such examples, we might begin to draw some conclusions concerning the way in which reviews were affected by their literary and political context.

The biographical information is more detailed than that given for the critics listed in Appendix III. In Taylor's case this enables us to gain greater insights into the nature of his relationship with the Sun. It also allows us to look at any contemporary comments which might throw light on the careers, personalities and writings of both critics. This evidence will be considered first.

Part i

BIOGRAPHIES

Although the two critics were contemporaries insofar as a substantial proportion of their careers overlapped, they did not quite belong to the same generation: John Taylor was born in 1757 and Robert Hunt was born about 1774 <1>. Details of Hunt's life are scarce, the main sources being a brief biographical sketch published in Kenneth Kendall's Leigh Hunt's Reflector <2>, and some scattered remarks made by contemporaries.

In Taylor's case we have a somewhat fuller picture, for in addition to occasional comments by contemporaries, we have a substantial quantity of information and an analysis of Taylor's unusual personality in William Jerdan's Autobiography <3>. Furthermore, we have Taylor's own autobiography Records of My Life <4> - an erratic two-volume work which, although actually less a record of Taylor's life, than a medley of anecdotes, nevertheless throws light on his personality and career.

Robert Hunt was born in America, but at about the age of four was taken to England by his mother <5>. His father, Isaac, had already emigrated to England <6> in order to escape persecution after publishing a pamphlet which had condoned the union of Britain and the Colonies. He had trained in law in Philadelphia, but his training was not recognised in this country and he became a clergyman in London <7>. According to the DNB Isaac 'acquired a reputation for unsteadiness which prevented him from getting a preferment in the church', but he was engaged by James Brydges, the Third Duke of Chandos, as a tutor to the duke's nephew, James Henry Leigh (after whom Robert's younger brother Leigh was named). Isaac later received an income from the Loyalist Pension Fund, but mortgaged the pension, and after enduring a series of distresses died in 1809, the year after his children Leigh and John had founded The Examiner. The details of Robert Hunt's childhood are scanty, although it is known that unlike his more famous brothers, he was not a Bluecoat boy, but was educated at a day school in Finchley <8>. Childhood anecdotes in Leigh Hunt's Autobiography <9> suggest that Robert was a hardy lad, for they tell of one occasion when he walked a hundred miles in two days and of another when he trotted beside a horse all the way from Finchley to Pimlico.

On leaving school, Hunt studied engraving with Robert Thew, historical engraver to the Prince of Wales, and must have practised this profession on his own for a while, after Thew had died in 1802. At one stage he became tutor to his brother Leigh when the latter was looking for a vocation: Leigh mentions the occasion in the discarded chapters of Lord Byron and Some of his Contemporaries: 'I next became pupil to my brother Robert, who had studied engraving under Mr. Thew, an eminent artist of that time; but I do not remember even taking the graver in hand. My brother himself was ill fitted by temperament for this sedentary and poring art, which picks and gnaws its way through the hard metal; though, for eye, I will venture to say that he was unsurpassed by anyone' <10>.

Robert Hunt's great uncle was Benjamin West, the president of the Royal Academy, so it is highly likely that Robert studied there. He certainly exhibited in the annual exhibition as a miniature painter and his entry in Graves <11> reads:

HUNT R — Miniature Painter

21 Lower Cleveland Street

1802	749	Mr. Thornton
	836	Mr. Sidney

28 Brydges Street

1806	687	Miss Oak
	727	Portraits of his two sons
1807	392	Portrait of a Young Lady
	511	Lausus in the Amphitheatre from Marmontel
1808	731	Mr. J Hunt

Church Street, Stoke Newington

1817	673	Shells
	831	Portraits of two Children
1818	728	Shells from Nature
	864	Flowers from Nature

Elizabeth Terrace, Islington

1832 805 Portrait of a Lady

1842 1043 Landscape

In 1806-1807 Robert did some of the illustrations for Leigh Hunt's Classic Tales and the design for the title page, his name appearing under them as painter and designer, rather than as engraver, but on the whole his career as an artist does not seem to have been very distinguished, and none of his paintings appears to have survived <12>. In 1808 when his brothers Leigh and John started The Examiner, he found a comfortable niche as the newspaper's art columnist. His marriage to Priscilla John on April 11, 1811, was announced on the back page of The Examiner and according to Kendall, the couple had a daughter, Mary Cornelia <13>. The title of one of Hunt's exhibits at the Royal Academy in 1806, *Portraits of his two Sons*, perhaps indicates an earlier marriage, and other offspring.

Hunt's career with The Examiner continued until 1828, when fine arts articles ceased to be signed with his characteristic 'R.H.' and appear to be by a different hand. By this time Leigh and John had left the staff of The Examiner, and the newspaper was in decline. How Hunt earned a living for the next couple of decades remains a mystery, but he did continue to exhibit at the Royal Academy, so he presumably still managed to bring in some money as an artist. It cannot have been very much however, for in 1848, Leigh Hunt applied to the crown in order to get assistance for his elder brother, and Robert was given a place in Charterhouse. Here he died, two years later, his death unnoticed in any contemporary periodicals or memoirs.

Hunt's absence from the memoirs of two of his contemporaries comes as something of a surprise: both Leigh Hunt in his Autobiography <14>, and Benjamin Robert Haydon in his Autobiography <15> and Diary <16> fail to provide any information on Robert's role as The Examiner's art critic. In Haydon's case, such silence has been interpreted as a little sinister: the desire to play down any connections which he may have had with The Examiner's Fine Arts column. The egocentric history painter and defender of history painting was friendly with the Hunts and enjoyed considerable adulation in The Examiner and it is possible that he influenced the content of Robert Hunt's column. An article published by Colbert Kearney in 1978, argues strongly that a letter written by John Hunt denying Haydon's influence on Robert leaves the impression 'that he knew more than he wished to comment on' <17>. It also suggests that 'the accumulation of similarities between the opinions of R.H. ...and those of Haydon in his Diary is, to say the least, striking'<18>. In support of his argument, Kearney includes among his evidence, one instance of the language in Hunt's column, directly echoing that of Haydon's Diary <19> which appears to be more than coincidence, but on the whole, Kearney is probably over-zealous in his desire to paint Hunt as simply Haydon's mouthpiece.

Firstly, as Kearney himself admits, Haydon's influence on the Fine Arts column of The Examiner is difficult to prove 'for the Hunts were far from ignorant of the arts and their views may have coincided with Haydon's rather than have come from him' <20>. Robert's constant championing of history painting <21> is certainly a case in point, since it would be easy to attribute it to Haydon's influence. However, Robert's great uncle, the history painter Benjamin West may have been an

earlier and perhaps more influential figure in shaping his opinions on this subject, while we must also take into account his having trained at the Royal Academy. Secondly, while it would be naive to expect Haydon's friendship with the Hunts not to have had any effect at all on the content of Robert's Fine Arts column, John Hunt's letter specifically denies the influence of Haydon on the opinions Robert expressed on modern works of art, and in this matter there seems no reason to doubt his word: the instance of the language in Robert Hunt's column echoing that of Haydon's Diary, is not an exhibition review or a critique of a modern work of art, but is an account of Canova's visit to the Elgin Marbles, where he perhaps relied on information given by Haydon. (It may be significant that this article is not accompanied by Robert Hunt's initials, but as this seemed to occur now and again through accident rather than intention, we cannot infer that Robert was not the author on this occasion). The other occasions cited by Kearney, as possible indications of Haydon's influence, are articles by Robert Hunt which are concerned with the politics of the Royal Academy, and another article concerning government encouragement of the arts <22>. Though the opinions in these articles are in harmony with Haydon's ideas at the time and his influence may well be present, it would be wrong not to credit Robert Hunt with some degree of independence. In Hunt's criticisms of exhibitions particularly, he was surely his own man: not only do Haydon's own writings show very little evidence of an interest in reviewing contemporary works of art <23>, but Robert's use of the first person singular in the early part of his career with The Examiner <24> indicates an unusual degree of personal responsibility for the

opinions expressed in his exhibition reviews - hardly a characteristic which one would expect from a mere mouthpiece.

The fact that Haydon does not mention Robert in his memoirs is an interesting point, for even if we cease to interpret it as something sinister, we must still provide an explanation for it: the most obvious being that Haydon omitted any mention of Hunt because he just was not interested in him. Haydon is quite candid about his friendship with Leigh Hunt (and their eventual falling out) and so by implication would seem to be unconcerned about revealing possible connections with The Examiner. Furthermore, he shows no reservation in acknowledging his exploitation of another periodical, Annals of the Fine Arts for the purposes of publicising his own opinions. Haydon's silence on Robert, in my opinion, does not suggest a conscious cover-up, it probably conveys the truth: Haydon was not especially friendly with Robert because he was not as charismatic as Leigh, and of little interest to a strong personality like Haydon. If it is tempting to see some of Haydon's opinions reflected in Robert's articles for The Examiner it is probably because they filtered through to him via Leigh or because they were of like minds anyway.

If we turn to consider Leigh Hunt's Autobiography, it does seem slightly odd that in his account of the setting up of The Examiner, he does not refer to Robert's role as art critic, and only mentions him a few times earlier on in the Autobiography during the course of some childhood anecdotes. Again, we might explain this in terms of Robert's relatively uninteresting personality, but perhaps we must also consider it an indication of his failure to make much impact in the public sphere. Robert and John were not Leigh's only brothers and in the

Autobiography Robert is simply treated like another less famous brother Stephen, a lawyer, who is only mentioned in a casual way on a few occasions. John receives considerably more attention, and this is because both he and Leigh were the joint proprietors of The Examiner and the subjects of a libel case against the Prince Regent <25> which is given much coverage in the Autobiography. However, perhaps we should not read too much into Robert's absence: Leigh Hunt's account of The Examiner does tend to concentrate on its political role and of course, on Leigh's personal contribution to the newspaper. While it may be significant that Robert is absent from Leigh's account (and his absence certainly should be noted), how much we can learn from it is questionable, since it might be interpreted equally as a measure of Robert's mundaneness, or Leigh's egotism.

There is however, no doubt that in comparison with Leigh, Robert made considerably less impact on his contemporaries in terms of achieving much notoriety as a public figure. Indeed the slim evidence which we do have on Robert does indicate a rather dull character. For instance, a description by his nephew, Thornton Hunt, unearthed by Kendall, is hardly flattering: Robert was 'an artist, utterly devoid of any natural talent, except for digestion, married to a pattern of conjugal worth and charitable affection... the thriftless, thoughtless, bookless, homely non-artist' <26>. In addition, information recorded by Joseph Farington in his Diary <27> conveys a man possessing neither much talent nor sense of purpose:

3 December 1812: 'I dined with Sanders in Weymouth St., Portland Place.

The Hunts (3 Brothers) were spoken of and stated to be as follows, - Leigh Hunt aged abt. 26, who was for some time at Christ's Hospital - afterwards had a situation in the War Office and at that time He attended the Theatre & wrote criticisms on the Actors &c. which were published in the Newspapers & much noticed. This caused him in conjunction with his Brother John Hunt to resolve upon establishing a newspaper on their own account, which they did with the Title of "The Examiner", which now has a greater sale than any other paper 7000 being sold weekly. Robt. Hunt, the 3d. Brother, is considered to be a very inferior man: He writes upon the Arts. All the Brothers are married and are men of very moral habits.'

5 November 1816: '...Barenger told me that He had long [known] the Hunt family, 3 of whom are now the Proprietors & Editors of the Newspaper called "The Examiner". He long knew their Father, who was a clergyman...His 3 sons, John, Leigh and Robert, were educated in the Blue Coat School <28>. John is now upwards of 40 years of age, and has a wife & several children. He is a man of good disposition. - Leigh Hunt had always great pride, & a desire to be uppermost in Society. Robert Hunt was Pupil to Thew, the Engraver, but made little progress and afterwards practised Miniature Painting but with no success. He now writes Articles for the Examiner. His disposition is light & unfixed to any material purpose.'

The significant part of Hunt's career as a writer on art, as far as we can tell at present, is represented by his contributions to The

Examiner during the twenty years for which he was its Fine Arts columnist. However, his writings were not confined to this publication: we have already noted his contributions to John Britton's Fine Arts of the English School and Henry Moses' The Gallery of Pictures Painted by Benjamin West and the possibility that to his contemporaries, his identity may have been more widely known. In addition, Kendall has put him forward as the likely author of two anonymous articles in The Reflector <29>, and one of Hunt's contemporaries, Cyrus Redding, mentioned that in 1821 Hunt wrote the Fine Arts column for the New Monthly Magazine until Samuel Beazley took over <30>. It is hard to pin down stylistic affinities between Hunt's Royal Academy reviews in The Examiner and the anonymous review published in The New Monthly Magazine in 1821, although there is some resemblance <31>. A reasonably objective test - a numerical analysis based simply on the works of art and artists common to both periodicals in their Royal Academy reviews from 1814 (the year in which The New Monthly Magazine was founded) to 1828 - does also appear to support the suggestion that Hunt was responsible for The New Monthly's review in 1821, however <32>.

Before turning to consider the details of Taylor's life, it should be noted that although in comparison with say, Hazlitt, Hunt's life and writings have not yet received much attention from historians of art and aesthetics (as was noted in Chapter One), in very recent years several scholars have begun to show an interest in his Examiner criticisms. This interest has coincided with an increase in the scholarly attention directed towards British landscape painters of the early nineteenth century and it is Hunt's comments on Constable which have been particularly singled out. His criticisms of Constable were examined in

some detail by Michael Rosenthal and Anne Bermingham in 1987 <33>, and Ivy's recent catalogue Constable and the Critics, devotes some space to considering his remarks on this artist. Ivy's comments are especially pertinent to this study. She has remarked that:

> His [Hunt's] writings deserve wider exposure than they have yet received. His long association with one of the most prominent Radical weeklies, his thoughtful and provocative comments on experimental handling and the genres (though, like Hazlitt, he was committed to the supremacy of history painting), and his prolonged curiosity about Constable's originality and naturalism should make him a central figure in any study of the nineteenth-century periodical press and its cultural impact, an investigation which is currently engaging many art historians. <34>

These comments which attempt to place Hunt on higher footing than he has yet achieved are partly a defense against Blunden's accusation that Hunt's failure to appreciate William Blake's art meant that he could not be reckoned a great critic. As early as 1929 J G Legge <35> drew attention to R.H.'s criticisms of Blake in The Examiner (though he had not identified the author) and in 1967 Blunden's opinion of Hunt was coloured by the unfavourable notice of 'Mr. Blake's Exhibition' in The Examiner (17 September, 1809) which at that time was 'the only criticism by the luckless Robert Hunt that anyone ever heard of' <36>. That for many years, if Hunt was noted at all it was only for his disparaging reaction to this one particular artist, once again reminds us of the arbitrariness of scholarly interest (Blake was hardly a mainstream artist in Hunt's time and the latter might well be admired for having noticed him at all, albeit unflatteringly - his review of Blake's

Exhibition is the only one to have been located so far <37>), but the more recent interest in Hunt can also be explained, at least partially, in terms of accident. Ivy, defending Hunt's criticisms for their 'thoughtful and provocative comments on experimental handling and the genres' and his 'prolonged curiosity about Constable's originality and naturalism', finds justification for singling him out and is probably correct in her assessment (his criticisms of Constable *are* noteworthy in terms of the overall press response to that artist), but perhaps the most important reason why Hunt has begun to be noticed by scholars is the fact that we can confidently attribute his writings and that he had a sustained relationship with one periodical. He therefore represents one of the few periodical critics for whom a readily identifiable oeuvre exists: in short, his writings are useful and managable, but it might be somewhat premature to judge their quality at this stage, until we become better acquainted with some of the less easily identified critics of the early nineteenth century. We shall now turn our attention to one of them.

John Taylor was born in Highgate in 1757. He was the eldest son of John Taylor, an oculist, who had followed the profession of his father, Chevalier Taylor. Chevalier Taylor had gained great status for the family name and profession through acquiring the position of Royal Oculist to George III. His son succeeded him, and Taylor himself, after being educated under Dr. Crawford in Hatton Garden, then at a school at Ponder's End, Middlesex, also trained in the family business and was a practising oculist for some time <38>. In his autobiography, Records of My Life, Taylor refers to his initial occupation when he mentions being 'in early life' acquainted with Anthony Pasquin who had consulted him

'on the state of his eyes' <39>. The autobiography reveals very little concerning Taylor's family, but he does mention that his father was 'educated at Paris, was a good French scholar, and was much admired for his quickness at repartee' <40>. He also mentions that his mother 'possessed an excellent understanding, was fond of literature, conversant with history, an affectionate wife and mother, a sprightly, intelligent, and good humoured companion, and always maintained a most exemplary character' <41>. In the introduction to Records of My Life he refers to having been twice married and in Volume 2 remarks that he 'first entered into the married state in 1788' <42>.

It is not known when Taylor took up journalism in preference to the family profession, but by about 1787 he was working as dramatic critic for the Morning Post and in that year succeeded William Jackson as editor <43>. He relates the circumstances of this appointment in Records of My Life, explaining that his predecessor was bought out for political reasons <44>. He continued to edit the Morning Post for two years <45>. He subsequently became a proprietor of the True Briton and although no exact date can be fixed for this, he certainly had connections with this newspaper by 1795 <46>. DNB informs us that in 1813 Taylor became 'proprietor of the Sun', but an announcement in that newspaper on 1 May 1817, when Taylor eventually became its editor and sole proprietor declared that he had been 'for nearly twenty-four years intimately connected with that property' (i.e. since 1793) <47>. The exact nature of Taylor's first connections with the Sun are left somewhat ambiguous by this statement, it could have been as an owner, as a contributor, or both, but Farington's diary reveals that Taylor owned one tenth of the newspaper and was also writing articles for it in 1804:

Taylor 'has now one 10th of the Sun, a newspaper of which Heriot has 7/10ths and a Mr. Clarke 2/10ths. - For His share Taylor paid 2 years purchase, and paid for it 150l by selling His share of the True Briton to the Proprietors of the Oracle. - He is also paid for the Articles which He writes for the Sun.' <48>

John Heriot was the editor of both the Sun and the True Briton intially <49>, but ceased being editor of the Sun in 1806 and was succeeded by Robert Clarke <50>. Jerdan informs us that during Clarke's editorship 'there was conjoined with him, for the lighter contributions of poetry, dramatic criticism, chit-chat news, &c., ... Mr. John Taylor.' <51>

By 1809 Taylor still only owned one tenth of the Sun: Heriot 'still retains 6 shares out of 10 shares into which the property of the Sun is divided. Mr.Clarke, the Editor, has 2 shares and Taylor one share.' <52> In May 1813 William Jerdan took over as editor and 'had a tenth share of the property, a weekly salary amounting to above 500l. a-year, and the "entire control" of the paper.' <53>

In 1815 Taylor told Farington 'that he had now purchased Seven-tenths of the property of the Sun newspaper, but that He was disagreeably situated as the person who at present conducts the paper does it under former articles of agreement which gives Him an authority over Taylor.' <54> Over the next couple of years Taylor became increasingly frustrated by his lack of say in the running of the newspaper and his dissatisfaction is recorded in Farington's diary: 'Taylor's situation with Jordan [sic] still bearing upon his mind.' (9 July 1816), 'Taylor I met. He spoke of His painful situation with Jordain [sic] the Editor of

the Sun who will not allow him any share in conducting the paper, though 9 shares belong to Taylor & only one to Jordain.' (15 April 1817).

Eventually Jerdan was bought out by Taylor, and some of the details of the purchase are chronicled in Farington's diary and mentioned in Records of My Life (55). Both these sources emphasise Taylor's point of view, that as the main proprietor he should have had some control in the running of the newspaper. In Jerdan's own autobiography however, we begin to see the other side of the story. He tells us of the terms of his appointment as editor, and explains the unfortunate circumstances which resulted in his power struggle with Taylor:

> The "Sun" newspaper had been declining for some time, or, as Mr. Fladgate expressed it, "The Sun was going down, in a very hazy set," when the proprietors did me the honour to select me from among the press writers, to conduct its editorship, with the hope of improving its condition... The fact is not to be concealed that Mr. Heriot the original editor and principal proprietor or the journal, Mr. Robert Clarke, my precursor, and considerable proprietor, did attribute the decline of the paper to Mr. Taylor's unfitness to take a lead in such a publication, were anxious to change the system. For this I was sought and brought in; and, always faithful to my own determined independence, I became a partner, receiving one-tenth share, and taking in allowance of between five and six hundred pounds a year for editing, with uncontrolled and uncontrollable authority; Mr. Heriot retaining five shares, Mr. Clarke three, and Mr. Taylor one, like myself. Thus we went on harmoniously for awhile, till in an unlucky - as far as I was concerned, and injurous moment - Messrs. Heriot and Clarke thought fit to sell their shares to Mr. Taylor,

forgetting that but for their first intention to supersede his deteriorating writings, I would not have been there - and thus making him, to an immense extent, the chief proprietor and me in that sense, an underling, yet in all else a political and literary despot.

When this apple of discord was thrown in, it may readily be conceived what it must lead to. Taylor, proprietor of nine-tenths of a rising journal, for it had risen several hundreds under my management, presumed that he had a right, at once, to annul my contract, insert what he thought fit, and abolish the Dictator!

Such was the origin of our contention. Taylor would write friendly, or what are called puff, notices of parties, so objectionable to my notions of (to say the least) public propriety, that I would not publish them. <56>

Jerdan details a number of the frictions which arose between Taylor and himself, especially those which were revealed within the pages of the newspaper itself, like the contradictory opinions of Byron published on consecutive days in a sonnet by Taylor and a parody by Jerdan, or the publication of contradictory notices to readers on where, and to whom to send their correspondence <57>. Jerdan describes the eventual legal wranglings between the two men and inevitably shows events in such a way so as to promote himself as the innocent wronged <58>. On the whole Jerdan's version of events seems very plausible, for the picture he paints of Taylor as an impulsive, eccentric and rather irrational being, does fit in with other evidence, and, in being balanced by some complimentary remarks concerning Taylor's personality and achievements appears to offer an objective account of the events which caused Jerdan

finally to quit the Sun. Nevertheless, Jerdan's inclusion of some of Taylor's letters to demonstrate the crazed nature of the latter's rantings, perhaps reveal some genuine grievances on Taylor's behalf. For example:

SIR,

You might well apologise to Mrs. Taylor for your brutal insolence to her husband, but she despises you too much to care for your *manners*. She only wants you to *do justice to her husband*. You complain of provocation!!! Is not your absolute tyranny over my property a continued provocation to me? Is your conduct to be reconciled to any principle of justice, or any feeling of shame? You know you acquired your power by *accident*. You never paid a farthing towards it, but have drained it of a large sum. You know it is justly my own paper, yet will you permit me to have the least control over it? Do not you monopolise power in all directions? .....Have you not, in many instances, brought discredit upon the paper? Must not everything that I write be submitted to your inspection, and, in spite of all the animosities which the practice has occasioned, to your *additions* or *alterations*? Sir, it is insolent to alter ever the position of *a comma of my writing*. Do you not garble the productions of official correspondents, and set your narrow judgment and scanty knowledge against those who have official information? If this be not the most horrible provocation, what is? Yet you complain of provocation. You call me a beggar. You are then a beggar's dependent, and live upon the credit of a

> beggar's property. But beggar, as you call me, if I had not forborne to take my salary for two years, and Mr. Heriot for the same period, how would you have gained the 8001. which you took out of the concern, and which, according to a statement, which has been made out, you owe to the property at this moment... <59>

The power struggle between Taylor and Jerdan reached its conclusion at the end of April 1817 when Jerdan sold his share of the Sun for 3001 <60>. The paper carried an announcement of Taylor's full ownership on 1 May, and Farington recorded in his diary on 2 May, 'Taylor I called on at the Sun Office. He told me that He had settled everything with His late Editor & was now in full possession of the Sun Newspaper.'

Under Taylor's editorship the Sun did not prosper, perhaps confirming Taylor's unfitness for the job (though the Sun's decline during these years was more complicated, see below pp109-110) and we find remarks in Farington's diary which report Taylor's attempts to gain financial assistance. For example, 5 May 1820: 'I communicated to Sir T.L. [Lawrence] & Dance the purport of a letter I this morng. recd. from J Taylor respecting raising a Sum of money to enable him to carry on his paper "The Sun" with more effect.' The remarks in Farington's diary seem to suggest that the running of the Sun must have eventually proved too much for Taylor and DNB records that he sold the newspaper to Murdo Young in 1825.

Taylor's journalistic career was combined with a deep interest in the stage and a facility for writing rhymes which verged on the compulsive - as Jerdan commented: he 'be-rhymed almost every incident' <61>. Jerdan explains:

> Tell him what you would, and suggest that it was a nice thing for a poem, and off he would rush to his room, get out his rhyming dictionary, and in a very short space of time, present you with the work done, cut and dry, generally, tolerably neat, and occasionally a successful hit. In this way was the clever and justly popular story of "Monsieur Tonson" written, and other tales, such as "Frank Hayman and the Lion" <62>, hardly less entertaining, which will make his name known to generations. A volume of these effusions was published by John Murray in 1812, and would, in my opinion, be well worthy of a reprint. <63>

Jerdan's comments about the durability Taylor's verses have not been fulfilled, so perhaps there is some truth in Taylor's remarks in Records of My Life, when, (with the reluctance to blow his own trumpet which he demonstrates elsewhere in this work) he attributes the success of Monsieur Tonson to the actor Fawcett: 'I am under...obligation to Mr. Fawcett the actor, to whose humorous recital of my tale of "Monsieur Tonson" I am probably indebted for its extraordinary popularity, rather than to any intrinsic merit in the composition.' <64>

As to Taylor's last years, an obituary in Gentleman's Magazine <65> fills in some of the details: his second wife was a 'tender and affectionate companion and nurse to him in all his afflictions ... [which] bore hard upon him in the last two of three years of his life, when he began to feel the infirmities of age, and particularly loss of memory. He had begun to collect memoirs of his early life, but had made small progress in the work, in the year preceding his death.' Taylor died in 1832 and Records of My Life was published in the same year, no doubt helping to provide some income for Taylor's widow whom the author

of the Gentleman's Magazine described as 'the very amiable lady who survived him.'

If we wish to go beyond the mere facts of Taylor's life towards some understanding of his personality, we might turn first to his autobiography, Records of My Life, the title of which is something of a misnomer, for it is decidedly sparse when it comes to straight-forward biographical information. However, as a series of rambling anecdotes concerning famous and not so famous people (many of whom were acquaintances of Taylor and others with whom he had never even met, but could not resist mentioning in order to pass on some amusing little anecdote), it reinforces the picture of Taylor which we can build up form other sources. Taylor's failure to provide much information on his own life <66> and excessive anecdote-telling demonstrates, even by the standards of his day, a penchant for gossipy prattle - a characteristic for which he was noted by his contemporaries. His writings follow no logical sequence, and he often repeats himself <67>, conjuring up the rather impulsive and irrational character portrayed by Jerdan. Taylor was rather an odd looking fellow by all accounts:

> His features were of a form which resembled an animated death's head, covered with thin muscles and skin; his body rather tapered from the haunch to the shoulder in the sugar loaf fashion; and below, his limbs were muscular and well built, as his casing in knee-breeches and silk stockings was properly calculated to display. This embodiment, his frequent associate, the humourous George Colman, described in his own laughable manner by nicknaming Taylor, "Merry-death"... and declaring that Taylor's body would do for any legs, and his legs for any body <68>.

Nevertheless, if Taylor looked strange, his character was perhaps even more singular: as Jerdan rather poetically put it, it was 'difficult to portray the mental structure contained in this casket; for it was a congeries of contradictions' <69>. Taylor was:

> known to "all the world": that is to say, the London world of quidnuncs, playgoers, performers, artists, literati, and the moving ranks of everyday society. He was a very amusing companion, exceedingly facetious, full of anecdote, and endless in witticisms and puns.

Jerdan's picture of Taylor, as a sociable man with a talent for witty banter is reinforced by the comments of other contemporaries. We learn from Joseph Farington <70> that 'His acquaintance is general' (30 April 1806) and discover his nickname "everybody's Taylor" from Crabb Robinson:

> 'Dined at Mr. Pordens. Sir James Smith of Norwich, the botanical professor, there, also Phillips the painter, and Taylor, the editor or proprietor of the Sun... the hero of the day was Taylor - "everybody's Taylor" as he is sometimes designated. He has lively parts, puns, jokes, and is very good natured.' <71>

Taylor's love of anecdote is revealed in Farington's diary: 'I had company to dinner...Taylor was full of conversation and of Anecdote' (15 May 1804); 'Had company at dinner. Dance, Smirke, Sir T. Lawrence, Taylor. Taylor chiefly engrossed the conversation throughout the evening in telling a variety of anecdotes of persons' (10 June 1820).

On another occasion Farington records Taylor's propensity for flattering people:

> I had company at Dinner... Taylor was spoken of. Boswell sd. such

is his habit of flattery to every one that his approbation is of no value. He wd. be best stopped, sd. Boswell, by the person to whom he addresses himself saying to Him, "I know what you are going to do, spare yrself the trouble, for all you can say to me I feel, being satisfied with my own excellence" (18 April 1814).

Jerdan too, remarked upon Taylor's habitual flattery.

> His whole being was entranced upon the stage, in the theatre and theatrical doings and gossip, and in the actors and actresses, with nearly all of whom he lived in intimacy. Even the foremost of these, it is well understood, are not unsusceptible of flattery, and Taylor knew how to fool them to the top of their bent, and be a mighty favourite in consequence <72>.

While the truth of Jerdan's description so far, may be relied upon owing to its being in agreement with the comments made by other contemporaries, we have no supporting evidence when it comes to his portrayal of Taylor's more complex characteristics. It has to be admitted that Jerdan had reasons for painting Taylor in a bad light, but in so far as he noted Taylor's 'smartness, his talents, and his ability' and acknowledged that 'nature had not been niggardly towards him' <73>, we might trust his description as a balanced account, unless it was a particularly calculated attempt to appear fair, in order to make his argument all the more convincing when exonerating himself from any of the blame for the conflict which eventually arose. Jerdan explains the paradoxical nature of Taylor's character by the fact that he 'was a being of the artificial stage, not of the actual world' and so he was:

> acute, yet trifling; experienced, yet foolish; knowing in one sense,

yet absurdly plotting as in a play; and looking for surprises and *denouements*, as if the game of life were a comedy or a farce. Over his passions he had no control, and though habitually good humoured, his recurrent phrensies were at once ludicrous and afflicting. At the wildest time of our differences he would cast himself down upon his knees, clasp his hands, gnash his teeth, and imprecate curses on my head for five minutes together, till some one humanely lifted him up and led him away to privacy. This incongenial merriment and outrageous outbreaks of temper alternated, and actions and effects, as in everything else, were redolent of the theatrical element, and had nothing in common with the common sense of mankind <74>.

According to Jerdan, Taylor had, mixed in with his talents, an absurd want of common knowledge and his 'ignorance of matters familiar even to uneducated persons and children was utterly astonishing, and could hardly be believed possible to exist in unison with such faculties as he was in reality blessed with' <75>. As an example of this, Jerdan tells of the time when Taylor's wife went on a visit to Scotland, travelling there by a Leith smack. Taylor wrote a poem on the occasion which began 'Hail, Sister Isles!' and 'it was with much argument in reference to the map he could be persuaded that England and Scotland were but one island, and that Mrs. Taylor might have gone by land, although she chose to go by sea' <76>.

This colourful description of Taylor which is fortunately preserved in Jerdan's Autobiography, and the odd pieces of information we have on Hunt should remind us of the reality which has so far eluded most of the art historians who have delved into the art criticism in the nineteenth century periodical press. Though so many of these writings are

anonymous - the unattributed opinions of faceless critics - every one of them is the work of an individual with particular biases, a distinct relationship with the periodical for which he wrote, a specific degree of knowledge of the visual arts and contact with the artistic scene, and various motives for writing what he did. While Chapter Two has, interestingly, revealed some similarities in the type of backgrounds from which critics came, the biographical accounts of Taylor and Hunt given above, in being more detailed, draw attention to an inevitable fact of life: that human character is infinitely variable. A commonplace thought though this may be, it is not without relevance to this study: if we do find that the writings which form its subject display such a degree of similarity that the personalities of the men who penned them have tended to have been obscured, then it conveys something of the strength of the idiom in which these views were couched and the power it had to suppress idiosyncratic and individual modes of expression.

Chapter Three: Part ii

THE SUN AND THE EXAMINER

As we have seen, there is little doubt that Robert Hunt was the principal art critic of The Examiner from its foundation in 1808 to 1828 (although the possibility that the content of his column was influenced by other individuals has also been noted). In Part iii of this chapter, evidence is put forward which strongly suggests that John Taylor was the Sun's principal art critic from its foundation in 1792 to 1825 (with the exception of the years 1815 and 1816), giving us a period of fifteen years when the careers of Taylor and Hunt overlapped. It is particularly fortuitous that we have this continuity of authorship, for it means that in our analyses of the exhibition reviews published in the Sun and The Examiner (Chapter Four) should we detect any significant changes during these years we can eliminate a variable (i.e. change of authorship) which, in the case of anonymous and unattributed reviews, would be the obvious explanation.

When we consider the periodicals in which we find Hunt's and Taylor's art criticisms, we must pay attention to the extent to which these contexts differed: firstly, The Examiner and the Sun differed in terms of frequency of publication, being a weekly and a daily newspaper respectively; secondly, as has already been noted, in terms of political stance, the papers were opposites, the former providing a vehicle for the views of the Liberal intelligentsia, the latter zealously Tory; thirdly, owing to the earlier foundation date of the Sun, each newspaper was at a different stage in its own history and and experiencing a different level of popularity during the period when the criticisms of Taylor and Hunt overlapped. In The Examiner and the Sun therefore, we

have two contrasting periodicals which should enable us to explore some of the relationships between exhibition reviews and their literary context, (unfortunately however, since we are examining the writings of two different critics, we cannot ever satisfactorily separate cause and effect: that is, a writer may choose to write for a certain periodical because it provides a context with which he is particularly sympathetic, rather than that context exerting an influence on the nature of his writings).

The physical differences between the Sun and The Examiner were as follows. The Sun, published every day except Sunday, was a four page newspaper made from one large sheet folded in half. Each page measured 14½"x19½". Most of page one was taken up with advertisements and page two was usually filled with Parliamentary news and Foreign Affairs, both these departments frequently spread into page three. Pages three and four were the most flexible in terms of content and the exhibition reviews were usually published on these pages, often along-side theatrical or concert reviews and, in the later part of the period, reviews of literature. Pages three and four were usually reserved for what Jerdan termed the 'lighter contributions' <77>. These included poetry, sometimes signed John Taylor or "J.T.", news concerning the movements of fashionable society and a monthly account of fashionable dress taken from another magazine such as La Belle Assemblée. However, more serious news was interspersed with such items and this might include news from the provinces, information on the Corn Exchange, or legal news. Throughout the period under study, the paper maintained a price of 6-6½d.

The Examiner was a Sunday newspaper, which also enjoyed a Monday edition. It was 16 pages long, measured 7"x9¾", and when it was founded in 1808 cost 7½d. Owing to its being a more expensive and less frequent publication, as well as having a rather journal-like appearance, The Examiner gave the impression of being more substantial than the Sun. In actual fact, (and one wonders if contemporaries were aware of this), it was in terms of area of print, much the same size as the Sun, and indeed generally contained fewer words owing to a tendency to use a slightly bigger print. Nevertheless, it had one advantage over the Sun, for while the latter was usually nearly a quarter advertisements, The Examiner was entirely free from advertisements during its first twelve years of publication. A typical Examiner (eg. 17 January 1808) comprised: 'The Political Examiner' (pp1-3); 'Foreign Intelligence' (pp3-7); 'Provincial Intelligence' (p7); financial information such as bankrupts and dividends taken from the London Gazette (p7); an editorial, providing a discussion of, and additional information on such matters as foreign affairs or current Parliamentary debates (p9); 'Court and Fashionables' giving the movements of fashionable society, describing the latest fashions and so on (p11); 'Theatrical' (p11); 'Opera' (p13); 'Fine Arts' (p13); 'Law' (p14); 'Police' (16). Usually 'Marriages and Deaths' were recorded on the back page. The 'Fine Arts' column was not an entirely regular feature of The Examiner. When the exhibitions were showing, weekly instalments were usual, but at other times the 'Fine Arts' would appear in about three out of every five Examiners.

In comparison with the Sun though, The Examiner gave considerably more prominence to the 'Fine Arts'. The Sun generally gave a very brief

report on the British Institution exhibition and occasionally reported paintings in progress or artist's one-man-shows, but it was its notices of the Royal Academy exhibition which represented the most extensive discussion of the visual arts and the annual focal point in terms of its arts coverage. In this respect it was typical of most of the daily newspapers of the period, although there were odd exceptions: for instance it has already been mentioned how the Times showed a bias towards reporting the exhibitions of the British Institution prior to 1823. The Examiner's greater commitment to reporting the fine arts was a feature of the paper right from the start. In the prospectus Leigh Hunt declared: 'The little attention which newspapers pay to the FINE ARTS, is no little proof of an indifferent taste, especially when we consider that this country possesses its own school of painting; that we have artists like WEST, who claims every merit so much admired in the old masters except indeed that of being in the grave; and that a youth, named WILKIE, has united HOGARTH with the Dutch school by combining the most delicate character with the most delicate precision of drawing...Yet they are scarcely ever noticed except in those annual sketches of the Exhibition which a newspaper cannot help giving because they constitute part of the fugitive news. We will try therefore to do a little better. An artist will conduct our department of the Fine Arts. If he does not promise for his taste, he promises for his industry. He will be eager in announcing to the public not only the promiscuous merits of Exhibitions, but those individual pictures which deserve to engage the public attention...' <78>.

That it was normal for The Examiner to have a 'Fine Arts' column and that it normally gave extensive coverage of the Royal Academy exhibition

must have affected its readership: people who were especially interested in the fine arts would undoubtedly have been attracted to a paper which reliably devoted a reasonable amount of space to them, possibly even if it did not conform to their usual political leanings. With the exception of a couple of scanty years, The Examiner fairly consistently provided eight to ten instalments of its Royal Academy review, these instalments being approximately a page (two columns) long. The Sun on the other hand was very erratic in this respect and during the period under study, published anything from one to twenty instalments, each usually about half a column long, (equal to one whole column of The Examiner). As many as twenty instalments was unusual though, and generally it tended to publish slightly fewer instalments than The Examiner. While Robert Hunt's writings in The Examiner were occasionally omitted to make room for other news, it was quite a frequent occurrence to find the Sun's critic, near to the close of the exhibition, lamenting the lack of coverage given to it, such as: 'The great length of Parliamentary debates, and other matters of temporary importance, have prevented us from giving due attention to the productions of the respective Artists - a circumstance that we much regret as these productions are highly honourable to the talents of our countrymen' <79>. Even under Taylor's editorship exhibition reviews were omitted to make room for other news and indeed, from 1819 to 1825 the reviews themselves became less detailed than previously perhaps reflecting the need for Taylor to spend most of his time and energy on the general running of a newspaper which was past its heyday, preventing him from writing so extensively on the pictures shown at the Royal Academy.

On average, The Examiner mentioned twice as many artists in its annual comment on the Royal Academy exhibition than the Sun. For instance, in 1808 The Examiner and the Sun mentioned 31 and 16 artists respectively, and in 1818 these figures were 82 and 34. As we have just noted, an instalment in The Examiner was approximately twice the length of an instalment in the Sun, but as The Examiner generally published more instalments than the Sun, it meant that on average it devoted more space to each work of art. In addition, while much of the Sun tended to use a smaller print, its Royal Academy reviews were in a big print and used a layout which was not very economical with space, allowing for less words per column than The Examiner. The Sun's regular format was to present a review of each work of art as a little section of text, separated by a space and, in some years, a short line as well as a space. This formal layout had the tendency to make the critic's remarks on each work of art a fairly uniform length. The Examiner's reviewer used a layout which looked less like an inventory and resembled more conventional prose. His discussion of different artists tended to be distinguished by separate paragraphs, while within each paragraph he might mention several works, but he was not entirely consistent and sometimes would mention more than one artist within the same paragraph. A new paragraph was not separated by a space and although the names of artists and titles of works of art were normally put into italics or capitals so that they could be picked out without reading the text fully, it required considerably more effort to do so than it did with the Sun (see Plates 7&8 for examples of typical Sun and Examiner layouts). Because the art critic of The Examiner did not present his comments in an inventory fashion, the amount of space which he devoted

to any one particular work varied enormously. Sometimes he might spend an entire instalment discussing just one or two works (eg. 21 May 1809, 9 May 1813), and this was often the case soon after the opening of the exhibition (usually his second instalment). It was customary for both the Sun and The Examiner to give a general outline of the exhibition in the first instalment, mentioning, but not really reviewing, a number of the most prominent works and the contributions of the well-established Royal Academicians. The last instalment of The Examiner's review was usually taken up with listing those artists whom the reviewer considered deserved mention, but whom he had not got round to reviewing in detail - often artists working in lower genres such as miniaturists, flower painters and medal designers. The Sun's critic also sometimes enumerated artists who 'deserved mention' in his final instalment at the close of the exhibition, particularly when the coverage that year had been scanty.

As has been touched upon, these details concerning the presentation of the reviewers' critical comments are by no means insignificant. We have already commented on how a reader's response may have been affected by such apparently minor details (see above p10) and the different formats adopted by the Sun and The Examiner certainly have implications concerning the way in which the reviews functioned and perhaps also how they were conceived and published. Owing to the fact that the Royal Academy exhibition contained such a large number of works (from about 800 to 1200 during the period under study), it is true that all reviews served an important function in selecting those works considered worthy of comment. In the Sun's case this function seems to be highlighted not only because it reviewed fewer works, but also owing to the ease with

which the reader could scan through simply to find out names and titles (an advantage for anyone searching for a review of a particular work too). The clear headings separating the critiques of individual paintings made the text more suitable for other purposes: for taking along to the exhibition and consulting in front of the works of art themselves (although we have no specific evidence that reviews were used in this way), or for cutting-out and using in another context (as for example, in a scrap book, or on an information bat - the latter, of course, designed for use in conjunction with the work of art itself).

In view of our earlier remarks on how the present art historical interest in reviews has tended to examine comments on particular artists and works of art out of their original published context, it is relevant to note how some exhibition reviews, like those of the Sun were more readily adapted to such an application because they used a layout which, if it did not entirely prohibit, certainly restricted that type of analysis which might attempt to interconnect several works of art (80). In contrast, Hunt's reviews in The Examiner demanded to a much greater extent that the reader followed through his comments in order, and appreciated a full instalment as a complete piece of prose, rather than treating his comments on individual works or artists as discrete entities. Such a difference perhaps implies a difference at a conceptual level: the instalments which made up Hunt's review each year showed a more systematic attempt to review a variety of different types of works, exemplified by his adoption, in some years, of a scheme whereby each instalment would be given over to a consideration of those works which were the best representatives of each genre or medium - history, landscape, sculpture and so on. While Taylor's criticisms were

undoubtedly meant to provide a commentary on the best works in the exhibition (nearly all critics perceived this to be their purpose), as bite-sized critiques of individual works, they could be published in any order, and indeed, it is quite possible that the critiques which eventually found their way into the Sun were selected by the editor from, as it were, a 'bank' (to suit the space available) and that Taylor had no say concerning the order in which they appeared (except of course, after 1817 when he took over editorial control). The effect was that although the Sun put the spotlight on a relatively small selection of works, it provided no systematic appraisal of the exhibition as a whole, except in its first instalment, which ostensibly fulfilled this role. In actual fact, owing to Taylor's unquestioningly sycophantic attitude towards the Royal Academy and its annual exhibition <81>, even this first instalment failed to offer a balanced appraisal. In short, the Sun's format and general approach precluded in-depth analysis and was in keeping with a position which saw no need to challenge the value of the Royal Academy exhibition <82>. This was entirely consistent with its political stance and comparable with the Morning Post, another Tory paper, which, as Hemingway has noted, found the state of British art 'almost invariably a cause for satisfaction because it reflected the virtues and refinements of the aristocracy' <83>. The Examiner, by being less rigid in its format, allowed for greater discussion (including the possibility of questioning the role of the Royal Academy and the value of its exhibition altogether) and revealed an approach which was sympathetic with its liberal sentiments and claims to objectivity.

When we turn to consider the historical circumstances which might help to place the Sun in a social and political context, of great significance is the fact that when it was established in October 1792, it was with the assistance of Pitt's government. Another government-supported newspaper, the True Briton, was founded soon after in January 1793, and although 'the precise nature of the financial connexion between the Treasury and these two papers is...unknown' <84>, Arthur Aspinall's detailed study has revealed that both newspapers most certainly enjoyed Treasury patronage while Pitt was Prime Minister. In May 1804, however, when Pitt returned to power, the Treasury did not resume its financial support for the True Briton which was absorbed by the Oracle in 1805 <85>. At what point the Treasury dropped the Sun is unknown, but (as has already been noted) William Jerdan recorded that the paper was declining when he took over as editor in 1813, suggesting that the Treasury had ceased its support by this date. Jerdan claimed that the Sun's circulation improved under his editorship, nevertheless it 'was being superseded as the principal ministerial paper by the Courier' when he gave up this position in 1817 <86>. During Taylor's editorship it would seem that the Sun no longer had financial assistance from the government, for in 1819 he wrote to Lord Liverpool asking for help:

> I have not only exhausted my own humble means to obtain the entire possession of the paper, but have involved myself in heavy debts to friends who assisted me, under the persuasion that the Government would protect a paper founded by Mr. Pitt, and uniformly steady in supporting his measures...A few hundred pounds would enable me to go on, and would secure the paper in the service of the present

ministers, whether in or out of power, and what are a few hundred pounds in these critical and threatening times to assist a man who for thirty years has been the strenuous supporter of the principles of the present administration, and is anxious to be so as long as he can hold a pen in support of those principles. The *Sun* and the *Courier* are the only effective evening papers in the service of Government, and Government in this respect should not solely depend on either, but "have two strings to its bow" <87>.

The following month, Taylor wrote to Lord Liverpool's secretary, Robert Willimot, expressing his 'determination to offer the *Sun* newspaper for public sale *next week*' <88>. The outcome of these letters is not known, but as Taylor did not part with the Sun until 1825, Liverpool perhaps yielded to his demands somewhat. Nevertheless, regardless of the assistance Liverpool may or may not have given, we do know that Taylor never got the Sun back into a position of financial strength, hence he found it necessary to approach Farington for financial help in 1820, only a year after his attempts to solicit the assistance of Liverpool <89>.

Although it is not known when the Treasury withdrew its patronage of the Sun, we can be confident that when it was launched in 1792, it was in particularly favourable circumstances and that it probably enjoyed financial assistance until at least the end of Pitt's first administration. Taking into account its privileged position, it would seem likely that during this period, its financial security would have enabled it to have held a strong position in the newspaper market. Certainly, we do know that it enjoyed a special advantage over its rivals by being given priority of intelligence from the Government.

This played such an important role in attracting readers that in 1793 William Walter (of the Times) was moved to write to Dundas complaining that the privileges enjoyed by the Sun were having a damaging effect on the sales of his newspaper: 'It is notorious...that scarce a dispatch comes from the Armies, or is there a Paris journal forwarded to any of the public offices, but what is immediately transmitted to the *Sun* office. This system is now become so general that I foresee my property in particular must suffer, if it continues' <90>.

As late as 1815 the Sun claimed that 'no journal in London takes precedence of the *Sun* in the priority or extent of official communications <91>, but Aspinall has suggested that the Courier was being favoured with priority of information by this date <92>. Fox-Bourne writing in the 1880s, put the date at which the Courier took over as the newspaper favoured by the Government even earlier, as at least 1811. His book lists the Sun among the eight daily evening papers which were then being published, but asserts that the Courier was the most significant:

> There were...eight evening papers; [published in London in 1811] but "The Courier" alone, now a recognised ministerial organ, only too cleverly conducted from a business point of view, was of much importance. The others were "The Statesman", which was a bolder exponent of Whig opinions than "The Chronicle"; "The Sun", which was violently Tory; "The Pilot", a short-lived, but while it lasted a vigorous journal, which started in 1807, made a speciality of East Indian affairs; "The Traveller", which in Edward Quin's hands was much more than the representative of the commercial travellers; "The Globe", which was practically an afternoon edition of "The British

Press"; and "The Star" and "The Alfred", the later lasting but a few years, and neither of them of any political account' <93>.

Nevertheless, even as late as 1818 the Sun must have been a reasonably significant London daily, in that Viscount Lowther thought it worth sending to William Wordsworth up in the Lakes, although Wordsworth in his letter thanking Viscount Lowther, indicated that the newspapers that were most accessible to him were the Observer and the Courier reflecting the decline of the Sun by this date <94>.

It is unfortunate that no circulation figures have been uncovered which might help us assess the relative influence of the Sun and The Examiner. However, it can be stated without any doubt, that initially, when the Sun was enjoying Government support, it must have been a successful newspaper enjoying high sales, and was one of the leading daily papers. In so far as the wealth of its editor gives some indication of its success, the knowledge that Heriot's income was 'at least £2000 a year' in 1795 <95> and 'something between £3000 and £5000' in 1803 <96> indicates that the newspaper was doing particularly well at least until 1803. That Jerdan's salary was £500-£600 <97> suggests decline in the newspaper's prosperity by 1813, especially when compared with the salary of Barnes, editor of the Times, who was on £1000 in the same year <98>. The fact that Taylor was suffering from financial difficulties from 1819 onwards would confirm that the newspaper no longer held a strong position in the market.

When we turn to look at some of the available evidence which might help us to situate The Examiner in an historical context, it should be noted that the fifteen years which separate its foundation and that of the Sun, comprise a significant lapse of time in the fast changing world

of the press. An important event which occurred in these intervening years was the foundation of the Edinburgh Review in 1802. According to John O. Hayden the Edinburgh Review 'not only transformed the reviewing periodicals already in existence, but became the model of all Reviews of the nineteenth century' <99>. The novelties it offered have been described as: a high rate of pay for its contributors; an independence from booksellers; a preference for quality rather than quantity in its selection of articles; and a decision not to compete in terms of the earliness of intelligence <100>.

While the effects of a quarterly literary Review on a daily newspaper such as the Sun must have been slight, particularly in view of Hayden's comment that as far as he had been able to determine 'no dailies carried [literary] reviews before 1815, and very few after that date' <101>, the fact that The Examiner was set up in a world that already knew the Edinburgh Review cannot be overlooked. Certainly, it is possible to regard the Edinburgh Review as having led the way for two notable features of The Examiner. Firstly, both periodicals were launched by young men - Leigh Hunt was only 24, John 33, and Robert 34 when The Examiner began <102> and the Edinburgh Review was started by men who ranged in age from 24 to 31 <103>. Secondly, the Edinburgh Review's independence from booksellers and intention to avoid 'puffing' had parallels in the objectives outlined in The Examiner's prospectus which claimed that the new Sunday paper would observe impartiality in politics, theatre and the Fine Arts <104>.

As the Sun and The Examiner were a daily and a weekly newspaper respectively, it must be kept in mind that in the early nineteenth century a newspaper's function in society varied according to its

frequency of publication, as indeed it does today. In the present day it can be seen how daily and Sunday newspapers fulfil different market functions, but in the nineteenth century these differences were even more marked when, as we have already seen, an important element in the competition between daily newspapers was their ability to provide up to the minute news: a function which nowadays has been superseded by television and radio. The Sun's privilege in gaining priority of intelligence from the government was considered by the editor of the Times to be an important factor in strengthening its position in the market, but it is quite evident that a weekly such as The Examiner could not be expected to fulfil such a function in quite the same way. Sunday and daily papers then, were probably never regarded as direct competitors: the Sunday papers had more in common with the monthly and quarterly publications of the period - allowing the reporting of news to have a lower profile, placing more emphasis on discussion, giving more importance to their role as providers of entertainment, and giving more prominence to the arts. Altick has found that Sunday papers were distinguished from the daily newspapers because they were bought mainly for the purpose of private reading, whereas the dailies were more often read in masculine public places such as coffee houses, reading rooms and clubs <105>. One might infer from this that in some respects Sunday papers were considered a more polite form of reading matter and perhaps more suitable for a feminine readership. On the other hand, certain religious factions objected to them. A letter from Wordsworth to Viscount Lowther points to this objection, as well as drawing attention to the lack of appeal of London newspapers for country folk:

> It [The Guardian] promises well, but a weekly London paper crowded

with advertisements, is not likely to suit the Country. It is dated Sunday, also; this would prove an objection to its circulation in many houses in the Country, especially as I observe Quack medicine, etc. etc. advertised <106>.

It should be noted also that compared with daily newspapers, Sunday newspapers were much cheaper to run because they did not need to employ a large number of reporters in order to try to be first with the latest piece of news. This was noted by The Literary Gazette in 1821:

> Few weeklies employ reporters or look much after original matter, except perhaps, that some of the leading Sunday newspapers obtain an account from the law courts on Saturday, and of any late news on that day. Their expenses are thus comparatively inconsiderable, and their emoluments great <107>.

Certainly, the cheapness of running The Examiner has been remarked upon <108>, for not only did Leigh Hunt avoid the necessity of employing a fleet of reporters, he was fortunate in finding good contributors who would write for low fees (differing from the Edinburgh Review in this respect). Hence, the minimal expenses of running The Examiner enabled Hunt to conduct a successful newspaper which was free from advertisements.

It has already been noted how the politics of The Examiner contrasted sharply with the Sun. Since they have been the subject of a detailed study by George Dumas Stout <109> and several of the more important links between its Fine Arts column and its overall political stance have been examined by Hemingway <110>, they will be summarised at present, though we will later discuss some of the political overtones in Robert Hunt's exhibition reviews. The prospectus of The Examiner declared its

position as a non-party organ and claimed that it would show impartiality in politics. But in making such a claim, it was already revealing a posture which might be seen as being characteristic of the liberal intelligentsia. Its early political stance advocated the abolishment of the Slave Trade; was opposed to the War with France; was pro-Catholic and anti-Methodist; and supported Parliamentary Reform <111>. In this respect it had much in common with the more radical Westminster Review, the chief organ of the Philosophic Radicals whose beliefs were founded on Benthamite Utilitarianism <112>.

A significant event in the political life of The Examiner during the years under consideration was the imprisonment of John and Leigh Hunt for a libellous passage concerning the Prince Regent, published in The Examiner in 1812. The libel case has received considerable attention partly because the Hunts made a greater public statement by choosing imprisonment, rather than the payment of a fine. Added to this is Leigh Hunt's rather romantic account in his Autobiography of the time he spent in prison, describing his cell which he had decorated with trellis patterned wall-paper and from which he continued to edit The Examiner <113>. In terms of newspaper history the libel case was not unique: The Examiner itself been very nearly the subject of two libel cases prior to 1812, (one of which involved George III) <114>, and John Walter of the Times had preceded Leigh Hunt as an editor who remained in charge of his newspaper whilst serving a prison sentence for libel (in his case involving the Prince of Wales and the Dukes of York and Clarence in 1790) <115>. Nevertheless, the 1812 libel case is relevant to the present study since it neatly demonstrates how, in The Examiner's case, its overall political stance and its more specific opinions on the fine arts.

were closely intertwined (though for other periodicals this was not necessarily so).

The libellous passage had been a reaction to a sycophantic poem published in the Morning Post in order to counteract the cool response received by a toast proposed to the Prince Regent at the Annual Dinner of the Benevolent Society of St. Patrick. The poem included among its various flattering descriptions of the Prince, the phrase 'Protector of the Arts' and this was one of the phrases which The Examiner chose to comment upon on 22nd March 1812 saying: 'That this Protector of the Arts had named a wretched Foreigner <116> his Historical Painter in disparagement or in ignorance of the merits of his own countrymen' (p179). This complaint encapsulated sentiments which were something of a *leitmotif* for the Arts Column during the years under examination: a concern with the poor state of history painting in Britain, attributed, not to a lack of talent, but to a lack of the sort of state patronage which was needed in order to nurture a species of painting which could not be financed by individuals. The Examiner was not alone in its acceptance of the rationale of traditional academy theory which gave pre-eminence to history painting above all other genres, nor in seeing public patronage as a national duty, without which the fine arts could not flourish and hope to grace a country which in all other respects was the leading nation of the world. Haydon, Martin Archer Shee, and William Paulet Carey all roughly adhered to this position. By the end of the eighteenth century though, aspects of conventional academic theory, particularly as expressed by Reynolds, were being challenged, and from about 1810 onwards, the hierarchy of genres was being questioned by some individuals, notably Richard Payne Knight, Hazlitt, Turner and Constable.

<117>. In view of this, it was perhaps not unreasonable that Donald Drew Egbert found the Fine Arts column of The Examiner at variance with its politics and described Robert Hunt as that 'surprisingly conservative critic' when he published his study of Social Radicalism and the Arts in 1970 <118> (although this may have been partly to do with the Hunt's reputation as a disparager of Blake at this stage, as has been discussed). However, more recent scholarship <119> has revealed that the opposing interests of connoisseurs and artists, subtle changes in the discourse of civic humanism, and the changing role of artists in society all contributed to a far more complex situation. In such a climate, some of the supporters of history painting, should not be termed conservative. For some, such a belief went hand in hand with a radical critique of the government and of institutions such as the Royal Academy and British Institution whose members were so powerful in making or breaking the careers of aspiring artists.

As we shall see later, although Robert Hunt occasionally made use of his exhibition reviews to put forward opinions on the art institutions, patrons, the government and other issues concerning the place of the fine arts in society, it was in more general articles that such issues were aired more thoroughly. As has been mentioned, Hemingway has summarised The Examiner's position on such matters in his recently published book and his findings might usefully be outlined here. He has noted The Examiner's willingness to 'take an unprejudiced view of French art, at a time when conservative critics made ferocious attacks on it as a kind of loyalty oath' <120>. He has also noted that in its early years The Examiner saw the monarchy as a 'virtuous family ill-advised by corrupt ministers', but by the beginning of the second decade of the

nineteenth century 'its view of the political establishment, and of the landed aristocracy' became increasingly critical'. The Examiner therefore 'consistently linked the cause of High Art and state patronage with parliamentary reform'. Its view of the Royal Academy was that 'it was just another branch of this web of corrupt public institutions which were parasitic on the body politic' and because of its 'general view of the deficiencies of the aristocracy' it was inevitably predisposed to look on the British Institution with a 'jaundiced eye' <121>. In the 1820s The Examiner 'modified the tone of its comments on the British Institution and Royal Academy' <122>, but its 'basic point of view did not change: reform of the political system and a reform of the arts were seen as intrinsically connected <123>.

Hemingway's analysis has pointed to a contradiction in The Examiner's position:

> The paper placed a very high value on art and venerated artists as a social type... It regularly voiced a patriotic enthusiasm for British art, and did not make such hostile assaults on the character of public exhibitions as The Champion and some other periodicals. This sits somewhat uncomfortably with its denunciations of aristocratic taste and the corruption of patronage. It means that the blame for any larger deficiencies in contemporary artistic practice had to be attributed solely to the degeneracy of the aristocracy. Indeed The Examiner explicitly denied that the artists were to blame for the failure of British painting to achieve a higher moral tone...<124>. It appears from this that Hunt placed no particular faith in middle-class patronage, and in fact he would have produced a more coherent and effective cultural critique had he

been willing to do so, or to make a more severe assessment of contemporary art. <125>

As well as drawing attention to Hunt's failure to 'make a more severe assessment of contemporary art', Hemingway places emphasis on Hunt's 'attachment to academic principles' and the fact that The Examiner 'remained fundamentally committed to a traditional notion of High Art'. His argument links this position with The Examiner's overall stance which, unlike The London Magazine of the 1820s (which 'directly challenged traditional norms of artistic excellence' <126>), failed to self-consciously take a 'class position' on culture.

While The Examiner's failure to perceive political issues 'in terms of an antagonism between middle-class and aristocracy' might help to explain some aspects of its Fine Arts column, such an interpretation does not form a major part of the arguments put forward in this dissertation. The present analysis puts less emphasis on the links between class and ideology, and instead places importance on the critical idiom which provided the tools for Hunt's assessment of contemporary art. In some respects it might be fair to view this idiom as a separate force which, though it came hand in hand with an ideology, was able to exert an influence of its own by imposing certain linguistic shackles which arrested ideological change. In short, while new modes of expression might be seen as being dependent on new critical concepts, the reverse is possibly also true.

In this way the limitations of Hunt's art criticism can be seen not just in relation to his political inclinations, but can be more prosaically linked to his training as an artist and his adherence to a language and vocabulary which precluded a more radical approach. While

class consciousness may have played a role in liberating art criticism from certain precedents laid down by academic theory, other factors should be recognised. These include the impact made by non-artist journalist critics who learnt art criticism from art critics rather than from academic theorists, the inevitable increasing inappropriateness of the critical criteria established by academic theory when applied to contemporary art, and the need for art criticism, especially in its role as newspaper entertainment, to be more varied. Hunt's criticisms played a part in this process, and as Hemingway is prepared to admit, the writer of The Examiner's Fine Art column was able to appreciate 'some of the novel features of contemporary painting' <127>. As we shall see later <128>, Hunt actually recognised the limitations of his criticisms: it was just that he was unable to conceive of an alternative, so steeped was he in the terms of reference which he had acquired from academic theory. That these terms of reference were abandoned by certain critics was, I suspect, in some cases, less the consequence of a conscious rebellion (against an ideology which might be perceived in terms of class conflict), but more the result of the liberating effects of ignorance.

In assessing the importance of Hunt's Fine Arts column, we must turn to consider the evidence which enables us to gauge the influence of The Examiner. Unlike the Sun where we were forced to rely on qualitative rather than quantitative evidence, in the case of The Examiner some circulation figures exist. Even so it is difficult to draw any very confident conclusions concerning the relative popularity of The Examiner because circulation figures for other weeklies are scanty. Nevertheless, the figures we have for The Examiner are helpful in giving

some indication of the paper's own rise and decline: at the end of its first year of publication its circulation was 2,200 <129>; by 1812, this figure had increased to somewhere between 7,000 and 8,000 <130>; in 1818 and in 1819 The Examiner's circulation had dropped to 4,000 and 3,200 respectively, although Bell's Weekly Messenger and The Champion also declined during these years <131>; in 1820, according to Hayden, The Examiner enjoyed a brief rise in popularity owing to interest in the trial of Queen Caroline <132>, but the newspaper must have been generally in decline because it was in January of this year that it began to carry advertisements for the first time <133>; such a measure failed to ward off its decline however, and by 1821 its circulation was down to 2,750 <134>. By this time The Examiner was definitely in decline: in October 1821 Leigh Hunt ceased editing the newspaper and the following month left for Italy, and in the same year John Hunt, (whose interest in The Examiner must have diminished after his move to Taunton in 1819 <135>), was imprisoned for another libel. The newspaper was left in the hands of John Hunt's son, Henry Leigh and was bought by a Dr. Fellowes, but under Henry Leigh's editorship 'its circulation gradually fell off, until in 1830 Dr. Fellowes determined to enlist the talent of Albany Fonblanque, and to place the journal under his absolute control' <136>.

In terms of its own success then, The Examiner's period of greatest popularity was about 1812, which suggests that the libel case against the Prince Regent assisted in attracting a readership. Comparisons with other weekly newspapers are limited, but we do know that in 1822 the leading weekies were Bell's Weekly Messenger, 5,020; John Bull, 4,500; and The Observer, 6,860 <137>. Using circulation figures alone, we

cannot be certain how The Examiner ranked in 1812, but since the circulation figures for the leading weeklies of 1822 were all less than The Examiner at its peak, and were taken at a time when, according to Altick, Sunday newspapers were beginning to enjoy a period of growing prosperity (138), we might safely assume that in 1812 The Examiner was one of the leading Sunday newspapers, and almost certainly the most important. In support of this Farington's Diary for December 1812, quoted above (139), asserts that The Examiner was enjoying better sales than any of the other weeklies.

From the available evidence we can conclude that both The Examiner and the Sun enjoyed periods of significant popularity: The Examiner around the year 1812, and the Sun from 1792 to at least 1801 and possibly much later. Both publications therefore make valuable studies for they undoubtedly reached much wider readerships than some of the other numerous periodicals which were founded during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (especially the specialist art magazines whose brief existences indicate a failure to capture any sizeable readership). Nevertheless, it needs to be stressed that neither of these publications reached a mass readership. General-interest daily and weekly newspapers were read and bought by the upper and middleclasses and it was only in the 1890s, particularly with the foundation of the Daily Mail (1896) that the daily newspaper began 'to circulate widely among working men' (140). In the earlier part of the nineteenth century, there were a few periodicals, those serving overtly religious or political purposes, which reached high circulations: in 1807 The Methodist Magazine, and The Evangelical Magazine were selling from about 18,000 to 20,000 each, and Cobbett's Political Register in

1816 had a circulation of between 40,000 and 50,000 <141>. In so far as such publications were extremely single minded and hardly gave the fine arts a thought, they are not very relevant to this study, though they do at least put the circulation figures achieved by The Examiner into perspective. Some religious organs were actually hostile towards the arts: The Christian Observer was 'prejudiced against the theatre as a corruptor of the imagination and morals' and even suggested that reading Shakespeare was dangerous to moral propriety <142>. The foundation of The Penny Magazine in 1832, should briefly be mentioned here, too. Selling 100,000 in its first year <143>, this widely-read magazine devoted quite a generous slot to articles which concerned the visual arts. However, rather than providing a forum for discussion, The Penny Magazine's expressed aim was to promote the spread of knowledge. Its fine arts articles were therefore of an informative nature and did not include exhibition reviews. Instead, they illustrated and provided descriptions of famous works of art, such as *The Apollo Belvidere* (15 December 1832), *The Elgin Marbles* (22 December 1832), or *The Dying Gladiator* (19 January 1833) - all mainstays of the academic canon. As was noted in Chapter One, the language and vocabulary of art criticism could slip into such articles, but as it was only sparsely used in such a context, we can learn very little about the development of this language from such examples, and therefore this magazine does not form a part of the present study (although it would be relevant to any examination of the wider issues concerning social change and the history of art in the nineteenth century).

We have attempted to gain some understanding of the context in which Hunt's and Taylor's criticisms were published and have found that,

although The Examiner and the Sun are representatives of that broad phenomenon described as 'the periodical press', they can be distinguished on many grounds: their degree of popularity, their own place in the history of journalism, their political leanings, their general format, their approach to the arts and so on. In this way we have placed emphasis on their differences which certainly need to be kept in mind when we compare their art criticism in Chapter Four. It might be wrong however, to make assumptions as to the nature of their readerships, on the basis of these dissimilarities: contemporaries who had a special interest in exhibition reviews and the fine arts, possibly drew available information from all sorts of periodicals regardless of political stance etc. - in the way in which some present day art historians have done. Certainly, it should be pointed out that some evidence suggests that certain periodical readers liked to enjoy a varied diet. In 1829 Charlotte Brontë wrote:

> Papa and Branwell are gone to Keighley... for the newspaper, the Leeds Intelligencer... We take two and see three newspapers a week. We take the Leeds Intelligencer, Tory, and the Leeds Mercury, Whig... We see the John Bull; it is a high Tory, very violent. Mr. Driver lends us it, as likewise Blackwoods Magazine, the most able periodical there is. <144>

In Part i of this chapter John Taylor's quarrel with William Jerdan was mentioned, and in concluding this consideration of the context of Hunt's and Taylor's writings, we must briefly acknowledge the extent to which art critics themselves had very little power in determining this context (other than their choice of employer in the first place): that is, the distribution of power among a newspaper's staff was, (and still

is), very imbalanced and in the relationship between art critic and editor, it was the editor who reigned supreme (except, of course, in the case of the editor-cum-art critic). Both Taylor and Hunt's positions illustrate very effectively the extent to which art critics were at the mercy of editorial control: Taylor, as we have seen, in spite of his status as principal proprietor; Hunt, in spite of his fraternal connections.

Hunt's case is interesting, since as John and Leigh's brother, one might have expected him to have had some say in the running of The Examiner. Surviving evidence however, demonstrates just how clearly the different functions of the newspaper's staff were distinguished. In a letter to John Flaxman, Hunt apologises to the Professor of Sculpture for the omission of a report of his 'last excellent lecture' in the latest Examiner and goes on to explain:

> Mr. R Hunt hopes and trusts that such an omission will not again occur. At the same time acquaints Mr. Flaxman, that though he writes the Articles on the Arts in The Examiner, the *time and extent* of their insertion, as well as of the Communications made on the same subject are under the control of his Brothers, the Proprietors of the Paper' <145>.

That Hunt remained free from prosecution during the 1812 libel case also helps to affirm that his role was solely that of contributor, that he probably took no share in the profits of The Examiner, and that he generally had little say over the nature of its content. Although there is no extant information which throws light on the exact nature of his working relationship with his brothers (there are no records which indicate whether he received a regular salary, or was paid by the

article), his status seemed to be very much like any other art critic of the period. He probably fared better than some: his stable career with The Examiner seems to have been pretty exceptional, and his writings were probably given higher priority than those of many other critics, but when an event like the Battle of Waterloo happened, neither his editor, or we assume, his readers, were especially interested to know his opinions on the Royal Academy Exhibition <146>.

Chapter Three: Part iii

THE CASE FOR ASCRIBING THE SUN'S EXHIBITION REVIEWS TO JOHN TAYLOR

An accumulation of inferences in Farington's Diary, material from a variety of other sources and stylistic affinities, provide evidence which strongly points to John Taylor having been the Sun's main art critic and exhibition reviewer from its foundation in 1792 to 1825 (with the exception of the years 1815 and 1816, and one notice in 1820, discussed further below). It was Finberg, who in 1961, first associated Taylor's name with the art critic of the Sun <147>, and other scholars have followed him, including Butlin and Joll, and John Gage <148>. However, the evidence for ascribing the Sun's reviews to Taylor has not, until now, been put forward.

Although (as we shall see later) because the content and language of much newspaper art criticism relied heavily on convention and stock phrases, stylistic distinctions are hard to pin down, there are good grounds for ascribing the vast majority of the Royal Academy reviews published in the Sun from 1793 (the Sun was founded after the close of the exhibition in 1792) to 1825 to two principal hands only <149>. It is argued that one author was responsible for the majority of reviews published from 1793 to 1814 and 1817 to 1825, and that another author penned those reviews published in 1815 and 1816. I will call the first 'critic A' (whom it will be argued was John Taylor) and the second 'critic B' (who was, most probably, William Jerdan).

Critic A throughout his entire spell with the Sun showed a staunch patriotism and, with one minor exception in 1794 <150> always viewed the Royal Academy exhibition in a positive light. As we have already seen, coming from a Tory newspaper, this was hardly surprising and is not

enough to justify ascribing the reviews to one hand. However, the critic's opening comments on the exhibition each year, although fairly standard expressions, display such a degree of consistency, that it seems highly likely that they are evidence of continuity of authorship: 1800 - 'It is with pleasure we inform the Public, that the Exhibition of the present year manifests a general improvement in THE ARTS. All the higher Professors in the various departments of Painting and Sculpture fully maintain the credit which their former works have enabled them to acquire, and the rising generation of Artists have caught a noble spirit of enthusiasm, and seem likely to preserve the splendour of the British School, when the present ornaments of that School shall have submitted to the stroke of time' <151>. 1808 - 'The present Exhibition...is highly creditable to the genius of our Countrymen, and manifests a considerable improvement in many of them since last year' <152>. 1811 - 'Upon the whole, the present Exhibition may be considered altogether as a national honour, in taste, beauty, accuracy, and expression' <153>. 1817 - 'We feel much pleasure in stating that the Exhibition manifests a general improvement of the Arts since last year in all departments' <154>. 1823 - 'It is with pleasure we state, that the Exhibition, in almost every department of the Fine Arts, is highly honourable to the taste, science, and genius, of the Country' <155>.

As well as praising the exhibition in this way, critic A was especially fond of congratulating the older artists for having retained their reputations and the younger ones for showing potential. This he did throughout the period. For example in 1801 he remarked, 'The established Masters fully support the reputation they have acquired and several of the younger Artists have obviously made great strides in the

road to fame' <156>. In 1810, 'It is with much pleasure we observed, that all our established Artists have fully maintained their reputation, and that the rising race are likely to follow their track with kindred ability' <157>. And in 1820, 'We...feel much gratified in observing the progress of the British Arts, manifested in the improvement of many young Artists, and the stationary excellences of those of established character' <158>.

While much of critic A's vocabulary is hard to distinguish from other critics (the widespread use of a relatively narrow critical vocabulary is discussed further in subsequent chapters), in his descriptions of male portraits he revealed a penchant for the adjective 'manly' especially applied to style or tone of colouring. Other critics might occasionally use this adjective, but the Sun shows an excessive liking for it compared with the other periodicals surveyed for the purposes of this dissertation <159>. Examples in chronological order, include: 1795 - 'There is force, dignity, and correctness in the figure, and a manly style of colouring through the whole. The likeness is uncommonly striking, and there is an expression of mind in the face, creditable to the discernment of the Artist as well as to the character of his subject' <160>. 1797 - 'This is a good likeness of the PRINCE, in a plain manly style of colouring; but, was not caught in the happiest moment, in point of temper, as the countenance is grave, almost to sullenness' <161>. 1799 - 'The whole is in a plain, sober, manly style of colouring, which we advise him [the artist] to cultivate, for he too often injures very beautiful works by scattered lights, gaudy tints, and affected negligence' <162>. 1801 - 'The Artist has given an accurate likeness of this venerable and illustrious character [the Earl St.

Vincent]. The Picture is altogether painted with a firmness and a manly simplicity of colouring' <163>. 1810 - 'This is a whole-lengh of the venerable Prelate [the Archbishop of Tuam], who appears with a dignity, composure, and meekness, suitable to his sacred calling. The likeness is exact. The whole is painted in a chaste and manly style, and the work altogether is an ornament to the Academy' <164>. 1811 - 'This is so faithful and spirited a portrait of the venerable Prelate [the Bishop of Cloyne], that we hope for the sake of his friends an engraving will be made from it. The picture is painted with a firmness and in a manly tone of colouring, and does credit to the Artist' <165>. 1813 - 'This may be deemed one of the best works which the Artist has sent to the Academy for the present year, and may indeed rank with some of the best which he has produced. There is a manly tone of colouring, and a vigorous expression of character. The lights and shades are so judiciously mingled as to produce prominence, and plentitude of effect' <166>. 1818 - 'Few Artists have made such rapid strides to professional skill as Mr. OLIVER. His portraits are not marked by mere precision in the representation of the features of his sitters, but by a characteristic expression in the countenance. This is a faithful and spirited portrait of Mr. PYNE, an Artist of well-known talents. the whole exhibits a manly strength and a sober tone of colouring' <167>. Critic B did not use the adjective 'manly' in his reviews of 1815 and 1816.

Another indicator, in terms of vocabulary, is the total absence in critic A's comments, of the adjective 'clever'. In Chapter Five below, it will be seen that an apparent increase in the popularity of this adjective suggests a change of emphasis in the language of journalist art critics and is important for distinguishing those writers who

belonged to an older school of art criticism, from a new generation of writers who had abandoned, or were in the process of abandoning the precepts of academic theory, particularly the hierarchy of genres and all its implications concerning the moral purpose of art. We will see that Robert Hunt, who as we have noted strongly adhered to the academic hierarchy, had a tendency to avoid the use of 'clever', except as an adverse criticism. Critic B of the Sun used the adjective 'clever' (as a favourable comment and without qualification) at least six times in his Royal Academy reviews of 1815 and 1816 <168>, and yet it never entered into the critical vocabulary of critic A over a period of thirty years. In 1820 the Sun's initial notice of the Royal Academy exhibition used 'clever' to describe one of the exhibits, but the usual critic subsequently revealed that he had inserted a review taken from another newspaper, as he had been unable to attend the private view that year - an exceptional circumstance <169>.

We have considered some of the principal reasons for ascribing the Sun's Royal Academy reviews from 1793 to 1814, 1817 to 1825 to the same critic, let us now turn to consider the years 1815 and 1816. The reviews in these years can be distinguished not only by the critic's use of the adjective 'clever', and absence of 'manly' (just noted), but for various other reasons. As we have observed, critic A was strongly patriotic in his sentiments towards the exhibition. Critic B however, found cause for complaint: the rooms of the Academy were 'hot and crowded' and the exhibition itself was to be considered more as 'a courteous tribute to individual vanity and ostentation than a sterling Exhibition which will exalt the character of our national school, and add much to the honour of our artists' <170>.

Critic A invariably published the first instalment of his review of the Royal Academy at least on the day of its opening, and sometimes earlier, occasionally making remarks which indicated that he had access to the private view <171>, a privilege we know was granted to Taylor (see below p136). Critic B, in 1815, published his notice after the public opening of the Royal Academy exhibition 'not having been favoured with a previous view of the Exhibition' <172> (although in 1816, he managed to get an invitation to the private view). The reviews of 1815 and 1816 used a different format to that favoured throughout the rest of the period. We have already noted how it was usual for the Sun to present a critique of each individual work of art as a separate piece of text, but in 1815 and 1816 the critic did not adopt this approach and discussed several productions by the same artist within the same paragraph.

In 1817 the Sun's review of the Royal Academy exhibition was very scanty - just one initial notice, giving a general outline of the exhibition. In 1818, however, it resumed its normal format, except that the critic made a point of trying to notice the exhibition more systematically than previously <173> (his first few instalments reviewed the exhibits in the order they appeared in the catalogue, but he abandoned this system after the fourth instalment). These circumstances entirely fit in with what we know about Taylor and Jerdan's power struggle during these years.

It has already been noted that Taylor took over full editorial control of the Sun in 1817 and his battle with Jerdan was at its height during the years 1815 and 1816. We also know that Jerdan was interested in the fine arts and wrote art criticism <174>, and it would seem highly

likely that Jerdan was usurping Taylor's usual role as exhibition reviewer during 1815 and 1816, therefore adding to Taylor's grievances. The scanty review in 1817 can be explained by the fact that Taylor had only just taken over as editor at the beginning of May in that year, had to devote his energies to the general running of the newspaper, and had little time to visit the exhibition or give attention to what was always only a minor department of the newspaper. Having adjusted to his new editorial responsibilities, in 1818 he could find time to review the exhibition, resuming his usual format. By 1819 however, Taylor was having trouble keeping the Sun going and from this year until 1825 when he sold the paper, the reviews are very sparce, often restricted to just an initial general account of the exhibition and a concluding instalment, with no detailed instalments in between. In 1820, as we have seen, the usual critic was unable to attend the private view and had to insert a review taken from another paper. Since Taylor was preoccupied with soliciting financial assistance at this time, this would coincide. Also, it may reflect Taylor's declining interest in the fine arts, something which he alludes to in his autobiography <175>. Another reason for believing that it was Taylor who was writing the Sun's Royal Academy reviews afer 1817, is that it is very likely that once Taylor had taken over as editor and sole proprietor, he was actually running the paper more or less single handed anyway: a situation often symptomatic of a newspaper in decline.

Having looked at the evidence from within the pages of the Sun which indicates that one critic was mainly responsible for reviewing exhibitions in the Sun for the period 1793 to 1825, with the exception of the years 1815 and 1816 and which suggests that this critic was very

probably John Taylor who had connections with the paper from its foundation and assumed editorial responsibility in 1817, we now turn to consider the evidence from other sources which link Taylor with the role of art critic of the Sun.

Before we examine more specific evidence, especially from Farington's Diary, it is useful to consider a few circumstances, which although in themselves cannot assist in making an attribution, are nevertheless consistent with the case put forward here. As we have seen, Taylor's early career as a journalist was as the drama critic for the Morning Post and his writings for the Sun when Jerdan took over as editor were described by the latter as the 'lighter contributions of poetry, dramatic criticism, chit-chat news, &c.' In our analysis of the careers of art critics (Chapter Two above) we have noted how, because exhibition reviewing was a seasonal occupation, a number of critics had some other function on their newspaper's staff. In a couple of cases this was parliamentary reporting, but more often it was a function connected with the arts or entertainment. Since Taylor was the Sun's drama critic and occasional rhymester, it would have been highly likely that he also wrote its exhibition reviews.

We know that Taylor took a considerable interest in the fine arts and in Records of My Life he refers to 'the knowledge' which he has 'derived from long experience in subjects of the fine arts' <176>. During the course of his memoirs he mentions a large number of artists and men connected with the visual arts. These include Farington, William Peters, James Sayers, Lawrence, Beechey, Cosway, Dr. Wolcot, Taylor (pupil of Hayman), James Wyat, Ozias Humphrey, Anthony Pasquin, Benjamin West, Opie, Shee, Francis Bourgeios, Prince Hoare, and Sir Joshua

Reynolds. Taylor claimed to have been acquainted with them all. In Records of My Life Taylor also alludes to the possession of some artistic talent himself: following John Wolcot's death he 'made a profile drawing of him, which his friend the elder Mr. Heath engraved, and which...was inserted in the Lady's Magazine' <177>. However, he does not refer to ever having had any artistic training.

When we turn to the evidence from Farington's Diary we find that not only was Taylor interested in the fine arts, but that he had a particular interest in events at the Royal Academy. His friendship with Farington enabled him to gain access to the annual exhibition prior to its opening, which as we have already noted, would tie in with his having been the Sun's art critic, for it nearly always published comments on the day of the exhibition's opening (always a Monday), and often the Saturday before. Occasions when Farington mentions accompanying Taylor to a preview of the exhibition include: Sunday 3 May 1795, 'Taylor called on me at the Academy & I took him through the rooms' and Sunday 24 April, 1796, 'J. Taylor I called on and took him to the Exhibition, where we staid half an hour.'

In Records of My Life, Taylor not only comments on having been regularly invited to attend the private viewings, but also having been a regular guest at the anniversary dinner held on Queen Charlotte's birthday: 'It is usual for the Royal Academicians to send an invitation to their patrons and friends, to view the annual exhibition a day or two before it is opened to the public; when I had the command of a newspaper some years ago, I was favoured with a card, particularly from my friend Mr. West, the president, but now I have lost all interest of that kind.' <178>; ' I knew him [West] many years, and often visited him in his

painting-room, where I derived much pleasure from his conversation. The Royal Academy used to have a dinner on the anniversary of the birthday of the late Queen Charlotte, and the members had the privilege of introducing a friend. I was the guest of Mr. West on these occasions for many years, and he generally placed me next to himself on his left hand at the cross-table.' <179>

From 1794 to 1798, (and for an odd year in 1802) the art critic of the Sun provided his readers with a list of the principal portraits shown each year at the Royal Academy, usually with his initial or second notice of the exhibition. On four occasions in his diary, Farington recorded giving Taylor a list of some sort. These occasions were 27 April 1794, 3 May 1795, 25 April 1796 and 2 May 1802, each occasion being a day or two prior to the publication of the list of portraits in the Sun. With the exception of one occasion Farington's Diary refers to 'a list of names' or merely 'a list', but in 1795 it specifically mentions giving Taylor 'a list of the portraits' which without a doubt must have been the list for publication in the Sun.

On a couple of occasions Farington's Diary makes remarks which, though slightly ambiguous, almost certainly refer to Taylor's position as art critic for the Sun (and for the True Briton). One of them occurs on 7 May 1804, and records: 'Lawrence dined with me...[He] spoke of Taylor's Criticisms on the Exhibition and said His remarks were often well pointed'. While this comment cannot fully affirm that Taylor was acting as the Sun's art critic, since 'criticisms' can be interpreted as meaning verbal, as well as written remarks, it should be noted that by 7 May the Sun had already begun to publish notices of the Exhibition that year. Infact, the Sun had already commented on three of Lawrence's

pictures, his portraits of Mrs. Siddons, Kemble and James Curtis (Pls.9, 10,&11). The published remarks are not entirely flattering as one might have expected, given Taylor's propensity towards flattery and puffing, but have elements which might be described as friendly constructive criticism. So, in spite of some clichéd use of commonplace and interchangable art critical terms (a point to which we shall return later in this study), there are comments on specific technical details which Lawrence may well have found illuminating. The Siddons portrait is praised for presenting 'a dignified composure in the attitude and countenance' and for being generally 'free from those gaudy breaks of light' which are too often found in the works of this artist (180). The Kemble portrait is described thus:

> This Picture has merit, but we cannot consider it as the happiest which the Artist has given of Mr. KEMBLE. It is by no means a becoming resemblance. This features are hard, and the left eye seems to have an essential blemish. There is an appearance of *affected contemplation* in the attitude. The colouring, particularly of the coat, is by no means pleasing, and the whole is broken with scattered lights. The Artist must bestow much more attention on this Picture, to render it an adequate representation of the original'. (181)

The comments on the picture of Curtis are generally complimentary and it is praised for its likeness, but described as being 'a little too bulky altogether for the person of the original' (182). If these criticisms were written by Taylor, they are interesting, for considering that not only did his reviews tend to comprise favourable rather than adverse criticism, that he had his reputation for flattery, and that he was

acquainted with Lawrence, they are not overtly obsequious, and may well have been valued by Lawrence on these grounds alone. Unfortunately, surviving documents throw little light on Taylor and Lawrence's relationship, but it does seem that the two were sufficiently friendly for the latter positively to elicit critical comments from the former. In Records of My Life Taylor boasted about his privileged intimacy: 'He [Thomas Lawrence] has often paid me the compliment of desiring me to look at his productions, and to give my opinion of their merits or defects; and I have sometimes been, by his encouragement, emboldened to offer an objection, which he always received with kind toleration'. The comments in Farington's Diary if interpreted in the most cautious way, do at least indicate that Taylor was in the habit of making criticisms on the exhibition. However, in view of the further evidence given below, it would seem more likely that the reference to 'criticisms' means published criticisms in the Sun (Taylor had given up his interest in the True Briton by this date).

The other remark in Farington's Diary which gets close to confirming Taylor as a newspaper art critic, is a statement on 25 May 1799 which refers to 'a favourable Criticism published today in the True Briton by J. Taylor'. Firstly, it should be pointed out that the True Briton and the Sun usually published the same art criticism (particularly Royal Academy reviews) <183>, and, as we have already noted, they were set up in similar circumstances, both with the aid of the Treasury. (The reader should also be reminded of Taylor's connection with both papers until 1804). Like the previous comment from Farington's Diary, this remark is a little ambiguous: it could mean that Taylor was merely the publisher, and not necessarily author of the criticism, but the

cumulative inference from Farington's Diary supports the latter interpretation.

In 1799 Fuseli opened his Milton Gallery and in May of this year we find the following entries in Farington's diary: 18 May - 'I went down to Pallmall, to Fuseli, and saw his Exhibition...I undertook to speak to J. Taylor on his acct. who I feared had some prejudice against him.' 19 May - 'J. Taylor I called on this morning and delivered to him two tickets from Fuseli. He spoke of Fuseli having behaved unhandsomely to him at Boaden's, - but that wd. not operate on his mind. - He would certainly do him service or be silent.' 25 May - 'Fuseli I called on in the evening & shewed him a favourable Criticism published today in the True Briton by J. Taylor, - I also shewed him Taylor's letter to me on the subject.'

The True Briton review will be considered shortly, but first it should be pointed out that in support of Taylor having been the Sun's exhibition reviewer, we find that though there are only two reviews of Fuseli's Royal Academy exhibits published by the Sun prior to the entries in Farington's diary, they do demonstrate a hostility towards the artist. The first in 1798 is fairly mild, but the second, published only five days before Farington resolved to persuade Taylor to look more favourably upon Fuseli's works, is severe, especially as the Sun's critic tended to avoid publishing adverse criticism, unless it were couched in terms of friendly advice, (like the reviews already quoted concerning Lawrence's Royal Academy exhibits in 1804):

> RICHARD III in his Tent the Night preceding the Battle of Bosworth. H. FUSELI, R.A. When in our general account of the Exhibition we mentioned this as a *good* Picture, we must be understood *relatively*

as comparing Mr. FUSELI with *himself*, for in truth, it is principally to be commended for deviating from the usual extravagance of his pencil...the general colouring of this Picture is clear and chaste, and we are not disposed to retract our epithet, but to call it a *good* Picture, compared with the former wild efforts of this Artist, who prides himself upon painting the *ideal*, and who certainly never stoops to the vulgar confines of *Life* and *Nature*. (The Sun, 3 May 1798)

The Cave of Spleen. H. FUZELI [sic], R.A. We have often considered the reputation which this artist has acquired as one of the *jocularities* of fortune, if we may use such an expression, for nothing have we seen from his hand, but a wild distortion, that seems more like burlesque than sublimity. In our opinion, this representation of POPE's admirable Creation in the *Rape of the Lock*, is not at all understood by this Artist, if we may judge from the present performance. The figures are vulgar, and ill-disposed. The woman in the *fore-ground* seems to be one of the *ladies* of *Bartholomew fair*, reposing herself after being fatigued by the labour of inviting the crowd to her *puppet-shew*, and most of the other figures may be considered as the *puppets* themselves, but by no means 'as *nat'ral* as life'. (The Sun, 13 May 1799)

In Records of My Life, we find sentiments very similar to those of the art critic of the Sun:

A few more words on Fuseli, and he deserves but few. His works are in general distortions, and no person of sound taste would ever afford them house-room. I remember that Opie said to me of Fuseli's

> picture of a scene in Hamlet, representing the ghost of Hamlet's father, "The Royal Dane", that the ghost reminded him of those figures over the dials of chamber-clocks, which move by starts, according to the movements of the works within. In my opinion a very apt comparison <184>.

These comments echo those of the Sun's art critic who also complained that Fuseli's pictures were distortions and criticised his figures for being puppet-like. Before returning to consider the favourable review in the True Briton, it should be pointed out that the Sun's critic refrained from reviewing Fuseli's Royal Academy exhibits after 1799. If the critic was Taylor it could be him carrying out his promise to Farington that he 'would certainly do him [Fuseli] service or be silent'. (There is one exception in 1818 <185>, when as we have already noted, the critic was trying to provide a more systematic review of the exhibition, and on this occasion his remarks about Fuseli are not uncomplimentary, but neither do they offer praise).

Taylor's memoirs quite clearly reveal his dislike of Fuseli: he even went so far as to remark, 'I never liked Fuseli, and, fearless of his satire never concealed my opinion'<186>. Such a statement might be seen as being at variance with the favourable review of Fuseli in the True Briton mentioned by Farington, but Farington's description does gloss over some of the slightly uncomplimentary aspects of the review (see Appendix IV for a full transcription) and, more importantly, the review has to be explained in relation to Taylor's views on the function of criticism and the function of the periodical press.

In fact, the True Briton review exemplifies the value of attempting to trace anonymous writers and shows how our understanding of the art

criticism published in the nineteenth-century periodical press can be widened by a greater knowledge of the lives and personalities of these individuals. The available evidence suggests that the opinions in some of Taylor's published reviews should not be taken at face value. While for the purposes of some analyses, such opinions can only be seen in terms of how they represent part of the overall press reaction to a specific artist, the present approach allows them to be understood as the outcome of a complex process involving the interaction between an individual's nature and beliefs, the wider society in which he lived, and the immediate influence of his acquaintances. As will be shown presently, in Taylor's case, certain facets of his personality, as well as his particular perception of the role of a public critic, played an important part in shaping the content of his reviews. It is the purpose of this dissertation to show how an awareness of such details can help to avoid a one-dimensional analysis. In doing so, it can provide a valuable historical interpretation of the literature which forms the subject of this study, and complement those approaches which like say, Hemingway's analysis, take this literature en masse, with little regard for the identities of its authors.

In keeping with Taylor's propensity for flattering people, it seems that not only was he by nature disinclined to criticise, he was compliant and willing to use his position in the press world to provide favours (the evidence from Jerdan, who objected to Taylor's willingness to write 'puffs' has already touched on this point). In addition, the evidence given below, will demonstrate that Taylor's views on the duties of a critic writing for a public print were such that he felt it morally wrong to publish remarks which might have a ruinous effect on an young

artist's (or at least actor's) career. In short, it would appear that for Taylor, personal opinions and the opinions he published as a critic were completely separate entities - so much so that he could write opinions which were contrary to his own.

Let us first consider Taylor's compliancy. Farington's Diary indicates that Farington was one of Taylor's main links with the artistic world <187> and it seems very probable that he influenced Taylor's opinions on art. It has already been noted how it was Farington who accompanied Taylor through the Royal Academy rooms prior to the opening of the exhibition and it is quite likely that he discussed with Taylor the 'merits' and 'defects' of some of the works and perhaps offered advice. The True Briton review indicates that Farington did intervene between artists and Taylor, as does Records of My Life, which recounts an anecdote telling of subsequent occasion when Farington intervened between Taylor and Fuseli on the latter's behalf:

> The late Mr. Farington, an excellent artist and a worthy and intelligent man, knew that Fuseli was no favourite with me, and anxious to serve him, he came and invited me to meet him at dinner, bringing with him Fuseli's lectures, which had just been published, and requesting that I would take extracts from them for insertion in a public journal which I then conducted. He said, "I know you do not like Fuseli, but when I tell you that he is in but indifferent circumstances, I know you will meet and endeavour to serve him". I met him, and the late Sir George Beaumont was of the party. The mild and elegant manners of that admirable baronet had an influence upon Fuseli, who endeavoured to make himself agreeable, and the day passed off very pleasantly.

Not long after I met Fuseli in company, and he asked me when I had seen Farington, and having told him it was some time ago, he said, loud enough for the company to hear him, 'Then he don't want a puff.' Such was his gratitude to the liberal friend who had interfered in his favour <188>.

As well as being susceptible to people soliciting favours from him, Taylor held a position which viewed the function of the public critic in the most benign light. One of his poems 'A Modern Critic' deplores the vicious critic 'whose pen is a bludgeon' and who is prepared to 'barter the verdict of judgment for pay' <189> and on several occasions in Records of My Life Taylor shows an admiration for the sort of criticism which praises more than condemns. His comments on the drama critic William Woodfall being one them:

I was well acquainted with Mr. Woodfall, and can bear cordial testimony to his moral worth, and the candour and justice of his theatrical criticisms. He always seemed to touch the true points of merit and defects in a drama, or in the performance; but while he proved his judgment, he was always warm in his panegyrics and lenient in his censure. <190>

Another is an anecdote concerning Anthony Pasquin:

I lost his [Pasquin's] friendship unexpectedly. On the day when the late Mr. West... first exhibited his large fine painting of Christ Rejected, as I was going to see it I met Pasquin, who was returning from the private view. He told me where he had been, and I asked him what he thought of the picture. He said that there were some beauties and many faults. 'Ay,' said I, 'but you are so kind and liberal minded, that you will take no notice of the latter.' He

left me abruptly with a frown, and though we often passed each other afterwards, he never condescended to notice me again. <191>

When discussing his own dramatic criticism in Records of My Life, Taylor tells of an occasion when he suppressed his personal views so as not to damage the career of a young actor:

> Having given some account of the theatrical performers who have fallen within my notice, beginning with Mr. Garrick, it might reasonably be thought strange, if I said nothing of so very conspicuous a character in the theatrical world as Mr. Kean. The truth is, that I never could perceive in him those high professional merits which the public have not only evidently, but most fervently acknowledged. I was unwilling to oppose my humble opinion to the public judgment; and as a public critic, I deemed it cruelty to attack a man in his profession, even if I could possibly have persuaded myself that my weak censure might do him an injury. Such has been always my rule in writing theatrical critiques, either on performers or dramatic authors' <192>.

From this account it will be seen that Taylor drew a sharp distinction between what he felt were appropriate views to be expressed publicly as a newspaper critic and what views he genuinely held as a private individual. This is confirmed by further evidence from Farington's diary and the Sun. In the former we find Taylor expressing his opinions freely as a private individual, and in the latter we find him toning down his adverse criticism when assuming the role of public critic. Hence, the entry in Farington's diary on 3 May 1814 tells us: 'Taylor I called on at the Sun office...Taylor sd. "Kean has art in His Acting in attempting to give touches of Nature, but it is low, vulgar art, without

dignity or elevated conception of character." However, the drama critic for the Sun, who without a doubt was Taylor, while keeping his praise rather luke-warm, nevertheless refrained from out-right attack, describing Kean's performance on one occasion as 'respectable but not great' and using a similar degree of low-key praise on other occasions <193>.

The Sun's art critic also generally showed a reluctance to publish adverse criticism, occasionally even chastising himself for having made an uncomplimentary remark:

> If there be any thing to raise objection, it is perhaps too strong a shadow upon the left eye, which gives it a dead look, in comparison with the other. But the Picture is so bold, the light and shadow so well contrasted, and there is such a sober energy in the whole, that we feel a repugnance in expressing the least degree of censure.
>
> [*Lord Thurlow* by Lawrence <Pl.12>] <194>

Critiques as hostile as the 1799 review of Fuseli's *Cave of Spleen* were rare, and as is becoming apparent, Taylor was not a little influenced by factors which were unconnected with the works of art themselves. We can safely assume that if the Sun's art critic was Taylor, his personal dislike of Fuseli, plus the fact that by 1799 Fuseli was a well established Royal Academician whose career was unlikely to be jeopardised by an adverse newspaper criticism, were factors which overrode Taylor's usual reticence when it came to unfavourable criticism.

One the whole though, the Sun's art critic avoided making comments which were too damaging and on one occasion, condemned the 'quick-sighted critics' who were only too ready to point out defects:

> We have neither space nor time sufficient to enter into a regular commentary on the merits of the respective works in the present Exhibition, and shall therefore content ourselves with pointing out...a few of the works which chiefly deserve attention. As to their faults whatever they may be, the quick-sighted critics, of course, will not pass them over, but we shall not attempt to lessen the pleasure of the spectators in general, or to wound the feelings of the Artists, by any assumption of refined taste and profundity of knowledge. <195>

Such sentiments would agree with those expressed by Taylor in his memoirs.

It has been necessary to point out how evidence suggests that Taylor drew a disinction between his views as a private individual and his role as a critic, for it helps to explain some concluding evidence from Farington's Diary which might at first be thought to contradict the theory that Taylor acted as the Sun's art critic. This evidence comprises two occasions when Farington recorded Taylor's opinions on the Royal Academy exhibition. On the first occasion his comments are consistent with the opinions expressed by the Sun's critic, as are most of the comments on the second occasion. However, those on Callcott in the latter instance do not agree. The first occasion occurs on 5 May 1806:

> The Exhibition I went to...There I met J. Taylor & Boaden. The latter after looking at Turner's Waterfall at Schaffhausen, He said, "That is Madness." - "He is a Madman" in which Taylor joined ...Taylor said of Shee's Prospero, (the head) "How like West's manner it is" - They both expressed a high approbation of Hoppner's

Venus, - and of his portrait of Mr. Pitt. Lawrence's circular picture was also admired; but Taylor said the lights appeared too scattered. - Taylor & Boaden thought the portrait of Mr. Pitt an admirable likeness.

In this year the Sun's art critic complained that Turner's painting *The Fall of the Rhine at Schaffhausen* (Pl.13) was 'marked by negligence and coarseness' <196>; his criticism of Shee's *Prospero and Miranda* is very favourable, but unfortunately does not make any particular reference to the head of Prospero, nor mention any similarities with West <197>; records do not mention any painting of Venus exhibited by Hoppner this year <198>, but it is possible that Farington was referring to a work entitled *A Sleeping Nymph* (Pl.14) for which the Sun's critic had much praise: 'If this Picture had the lustre of an ancient name, and were not so fresh in its colouring, it would hold a distinguished rank with the best productions of the same kind from celebrated Artists, and gain a high price...It is...drawn with great skill, and beautifully coloured...It is...a capital Work on the whole, and would do honour to any School of Painting' <199>; Hoppner's portrait of *Mr. Pitt* (Pl.15) was selected as the first picture to receive detailed criticism in the Sun in 1806, and it receives very high praise and its 'excellent likeness' is remarked upon <200>; the circular picture which Lawrence exhibited in 1806 was a portrait of *Mrs. Maguire* (Pl.16) (the mistress of the Marquis of Abercorn) which was complimented by the Sun's critic in his initial general account of the exhibition <201>. He did not publish a detailed criticism of the picture and the 'scattered lights' are not mentioned, but on other occasions the critic frequently commented on Lawrence's tendency to 'gaudiness and glare' <202>.

The second occasion when Farington recorded Taylor's remarks concerning the Royal Academy exhibition was on 9 May 1807:

> Taylor said to me 'That Lawrence was at the top of his Art.' That Calcot [sic] has not nature in his pictures, that the figures seem as if stuck on. Turner's Marine subject he liked.'

In the same year we find the critic of the Sun praising Lawrence's portrait of *Francis Baring and his friends* (Pl.17) as the best painting in the exhibition: 'LAWRENCE's picture of Sir FRANCIS BARING, and of two of his friends, may be considered as the chief effort of this year. It is a very splendid picture' <203>; the critic also has praise for Turner's painting *Sun rising through Vapour* (Pl.18): 'Here Mr. TURNER appears in his proper element, and this is a work highly creditable to his talents. - It is conceived in a bold style, and would maintain a distinguished rank in comparison with some of the best works of the kind. There is a simplicity as well as a grandeur in the whole, that render it one of the chief ornaments of the present Exhibition' <204>. Such comments again agree with those reported by Farington.

However, if Taylor was the art critic for the Sun, and most of the evidence points to this conclusion, his remarks concerning Callcott reported by Farington can only be explained if we are willing to accept the argument that Taylor was capable of thinking one thing and writing another: throughout his career the critic of the Sun was generally complimentary towards Callcott's paintings <205> and in 1807 in particular, Callcott was praised for having 'five excellent specimens of his skill' <206> and for having 'progressively increased in merit' and 'made still greater advances in the province of Landscape' <207>. It must be born in mind that Callcott was still quite young in 1807, so

Taylor was perhaps unwilling to condemn his works too sharply, for fear of damaging his career. Also, though we have no evidence to confirm it, it is possible that Farington was exerting some influence, in the way in which he intervened on behalf of Fuseli.

It would be wrong not to touch on the slightly problematic nature of the case for ascribing the Sun's exhibition reviews to Taylor or ignore one final point which does not assist the case. That is, although there are very good grounds for ascribing most of the Sun's Royal Academy reviews to Taylor (except of course, for the years 1815 and 1816), it must be acknowledged that because all exhibition reviews of this period relied on many similar expressions, there is some possibility that odd critiques by other hands were occasionally inserted (perhaps in amongst those by Taylor), or, that as a result of editorial intervention, some of Taylor's original opinions and expressions were altered. In spite of such possibilities however, the evidence points strongly in favour of Taylor, and therefore, from now on, the art critic of the Sun will be referred to as Taylor, allowing for the assumptions made during the course of this ascription.

In conclusion, let us turn to some additional supporting evidence. We have surmised that Farington played a part in shaping Taylor's opinions, and a couple of points help to reinforce this supposition. There is no evidence to suggest that Taylor ever had any formal training in the fine arts, but, as we have already noted, his memoirs mention 'the knowledge...derived from long experience in subjects of the fine arts'. This specifically seems to imply that type of knowledge which might be learned through an acquaintance with artists and other men connected with the fine arts - a growing familiarity with the subject,

rather than an official grounding. This would also tie in with the voice adopted by the Sun's art critic who on more that one occasion assumed the position of knowledgeable layman. We have already noted the critic declaring his intention to make no 'assumption of refined taste and profundity of knowledge' and on another occasion we find him criticising 'the higher Critics' who affect to treat the ability to take a good likeness with indifference and who 'talk much of lightness of effect and general spirit, and seem to consider the chief recommendation, if not essential quality, of portrait-painting as beneath their notice' <208>.

Another supporting piece of evidence is a record in Farington's Diary of Taylor having been at Turner's Gallery in June 1810: 'Turner's Gallery I went to, & and there met Taylor, Prince Hoare & Richd. Smirke' <209>. On 12th June, just four days after Farington's entry, the Sun published the only known review of Turner's exhibition <210>.

We have already noted how the Sun's regular critic revealed a fondness for the adjective 'manly' in his critiques of male portraits. In addition, 'dignified' and 'firm' (or their variants) occur with a frequency which appears to be above average. Examples include the following: 'There is...a sober dignity in the colouring' <211>, 'The outline of the figure is firm and manly' <212>, 'The whole is characterised by a sober dignity' <213>, 'The whole is marked by a dignified firmness' <214>.

In Records of My Life, Taylor does sometimes reveal a liking for these words. A striking instance of this is his description of William Smith's retirement speech, in which he makes use of the adjective 'manly' in consecutive sentences as well as making use of 'dignity' and 'firmness': 'His address was brief but emphatic, and delivered with a

manly dignity, and fervid expression of gratitude that powerfully operated on the audience. At one time the applause was so great, that I thought it was likely to subdue his firmness; but he paused for a moment, and then resumed his speech with all the manly buoyancy of his character' <215>.

Also, we have seen how the usual critic of the Sun took a very favourable view of the Royal Academy. Such sentiments were not peculiar to the Sun's art critic, but we can at least confirm that they coincided with those held by Taylor, who in Records of My Life remarked how George the Third was fond of the fine arts, and a liberal patron of them: 'To his liberality we owe the Royal Academy, to which we are indebted for that progress in national taste which has rendered the British school of painting superior to that of any other country' <216>.

Finally, we have evidence from Turner's correspondence which seems to confirm Taylor's position as the Sun's principal art critic. It comprises three letters: one thanking Taylor for his 'kind and honourable notice of my [Turner's] endeavours on Monday night' - a reference to a flattering review of Turner's first lecture as Professor of Perspective at Royal Academy published in the Sun on 8 January 1811; the second, in verse, thanks Taylor for his favourable review (in the Sun 15 January 1811) of Turner's second lecture on perspective; the third letter thanks Taylor for his 'kindness in the Sun of yesterday' and adds 'I feel great pleasure in your thinking my endeavours deserving such attention'. This undated letter may again refer to a Sun review of one of Turner's other lectures (reviews appeared on 22 January, 29 January, 5 February, and 15 February 1811) or, as Finberg has suggested, may be thanking Taylor for a favourable criticism of *Mercury and Hersé*

(Pl.19) in the Sun of 30 April 1811. Turner's picture was the first work to receive detailed discussion in the Sun's review of the Royal Academy exhibition that year and Turner is known to have copied the complimentary criticism into a sketching book (217).

Chapter Four

Taylor's and Hunt's Reviews Compared

We have already made some comparisons concerning the way in which the Sun's and The Examiner's Royal Academy reviews were presented, and have observed how the different formats adopted by each periodical influenced certain aspects of their content <1>. The Sun's more formal layout did not favour comments which interconnected or compared different works of art, and tended to result in individual critiques which were approximately the same length (for the sake of consistency of presentation). It therefore restricted the scope for very detailed commentaries or the discussion of more general aesthetic topics. In so far as a preference for such a layout must, in Taylor's case, be attributed to the critic himself, rather than editorial pressure (for as we have seen, the Sun's reviews changed in format during 1815 and 1816, when it appears that a critic other than Taylor was writing them, and resumed their normal format when Taylor took over full control of the paper) it can be inferred that critics varied in how they perceived their function. While most critics undoubtedly felt that one of the primary purposes of their review was to provide an assessment of the best works in the exhibition, Hunt, as we have already observed, chose to comment on the best representatives of each different genre. In this respect, he was placing a greater emphasis on assessing the quality of the exhibition as a whole, within certain aesthetic terms which estimated the value of paintings by their subject matter. For him, the exhibition represented a manifestation of what was generally termed the 'state of the Fine Arts in this country' or the 'progress of the Fine

Arts in this country', depending on whether the out-look was optimistic or not. Such a concept implied a set of values which in Hunt's case, included an acceptance of the hierarchy of genres and a belief that the rise of history painting was essential not only for the gradual improvement of the fine arts, but also to set Britain on a par with the great classical societies of the past. Hunt was by no means the only critic concerned with this evaluative concept, (it had played a part in critics' reviews from the earliest years onwards <2>) but he often gave it a particular importance by concluding the season with an article offering a general commentary on all the exhibitions that year. These articles had headings such as 'State of British Art, as evinced by this Year's Exhibitions' or 'State of the Arts as deduced from the Late Annual Exhibitions' <3>. Taylor, as we have seen, notionally applied this criterion, but as it was only as a brief comment which invariably found the Royal Academy exhibition proof of progress in the arts, it cannot be said to have played a significant part in his function as a critic. His individual critiques, spot-lighting a small number of works formed the essence of his review, even though they were presented in a completely unsystematic way, like prizes drawn out of a lucky-dip: he might discuss a portrait, then a landscape, then another portrait, a history piece, another portrait and so on. He discussed different artists at random too: if he mentioned an artist more than once it could be in consecutive critiques or it could be in separate instalments. His review tended to concentrate on those works exhibited in the Great Room and he rarely gave any consideration to sculpture, miniatures, architectural drawings or other 'departments' which were not exhibited in the Great Room. He generally reserved the first detailed critique

for a discussion of what he considered to be the 'best work', but otherwise his review showed no logical approach. This seemingly random character of his review each year was deceptive, since he was undoubtedly aware of the value of reviews as publicity for both artists and subjects of portraits, and was, of course, exercising powers of selection by choosing to give certain works favourable or unfavourable publicity and ignoring others.

Taylor's reviews were largely devoted to discussing portraiture - it generally accounted for approximately half his review each year, but in giving this genre more space than others, his reviews were probably more evenly distributed than Hunt's. In 1808 for instance, Taylor reviewed fourteen portraits and fourteen works of art belonging to other genres. In the same year Hunt reviewed fifteen portraits, twenty-two historical and 'fancy' pieces, and seven of other genres (he did not comment on the sculpture that year). In Academic Annals the same year, Prince Hoare noted that approximately an eighth of the exhibits comprised history and fancy subjects (4), so Hunt, in devoting half of his review to such subjects gave them a disproportionate amount of attention - this attention simply reflected the value he assigned to them and was not a reflection of their presence in the exhibition as a whole. Hoare did not specify the number of portraits, but noted that out of 998 works, 752 comprised portraits, landscapes, picturesque drawings and a few engravings, so it is likely that the proportion of portraits in Taylor's review was similar to the proportion in the exhibition.

As a resolute supporter of the Royal Academy throughout his career, Taylor was conspicuously silent on two matters which were of perennial interest to the many critics who viewed that institution through glasses

a little less rose-tinted: the preponderance of portraits in the exhibition and the lack of history painting. Commentators who drew attention to these matters were usually critics who were openly hostile to the Royal Academy, but even a pro-Academy voice such as that of Prince Hoare, whose Academic Annals (just mentioned) were designed to give favourable publicity to the Royal Academy, found the 'monotonous prevalence of Portraits' a cause for lament <5>. On the whole though, those commentators who were critical of the excessive number of portraits in the exhibition, represented a body of opinion (discernable throughout the entire period) who took a pessimistic view of the state of taste and the state of the fine arts. Depending on the various political stances involved, the critics placed the blame on artists generally, the Royal Academy specifically, the monarchy, the government, the aristocracy or the middle-classes, in various permutations. Above all, it was the exhibition system itself which was criticised for fostering the vanity of individuals, encouraging the wrong sort of competition between artists and failing to encourage the arts to flourish. A pessimistic view of the growing commercialisation of the arts became common by 1830: 'Art has too grovelling and mercantile a spirit; it keeps its ledgers, its debtor and creditor account, and smacks of the counting house' remarked one periodical writer in that year <6>. The redundancy of portraiture was associated in the minds of many critics, from the earliest reviews onwards, with an overwhelming visual impression of the exhibition which they characterised with words like 'glitter', 'glare' and 'gaudiness'. In 1781 George Cumberland noted in the Morning Chronicle how the artist, 'having once discovered that the highest coloured pictures are those which attract publick

notice most,... alters his style, or at least paints in that manner for the Exhibition' resulting in the 'profusion of rosy cheeks, cherry lips, and black eye-brows, which thrust themselves on our notice the moment we enter a modern exhibition room' <7>. The same critic also noticed how the fashion for ornate gold frames added to the overall effect of glare and gaudiness. In 1814, Hazlitt thought the standard of portraiture was improving, but lamented the number of exhibitions he *had* seen:

> In which the eye in vain sought relief from the glitter of the frames in the glare of the pictures, in which vermilion cheeks made vermilion lips look pale, in which the merciless spendour of the painter's pallet put nature out of countenance, and in which the unmeaning grimace of fashion and folly was the only variety in the wide dazzling waste of colour <8>.

In spite of the improvement detected by Hazlitt, critics continued to complain of the glitter and glare caused by over-ostentatious portraits. In 1820 the critic of The New Monthly Magazine (probably William Carey) noted:

> The public eye is diverted by the glare of the half-lengths and whole-lengths, from the modest pictures clad in sober hues which peep out amongst them. The visitors are portrait-critics, their chief delight is to find a resemblance; and the landscape painter is...compelled to paint, in bright and exaggerated colours, that his pieces may have some chance of attracting notice among the gaudy masses of the portraits; and hence "an exhibition-picture" is a term too well known among artists <9>.

In 1822 Hunt found Constable's *View on the Stour near Dedham* a 'consoling recollection of the charms of nature' among the 'glare of

gold frames and gaudy colours' <10>. The complaint concerning the number of portraits and their injurous effects on the other pictures persisted until the end of the period: Helene Roberts for instance, cites the critic of The Art-Union of 1845 who complained not only of the numbers of portraits, but also of their size: since portraits were frequently full-length and life-sized, they took up too much space on the Academy's walls, leaving little room for other genres - the critic illustrated the point with a plan of the pictures above the line, showing the space occupied by portraits <11>.

The two concepts, excess of portrait and scareness of history, went hand in hand, though in Hunt's reviews it was the latter, rather than the former which was usually stressed. This was because, as has already been noted, he tended to take a sympathetic attitude towards artists, (though in the middle part of his career he became more critical of them, especially the Royal Academicians), and his early views were centred around the notion that it was not the producers, but the patrons of art who were to blame for not giving the 'higher departments' due encouragement. The government, especially, had to take the final responsibility for fostering a society which put so little value on the fine arts:

> The few works in the higher department of Art in latter Exhibitions, and in that which opens tomorrow at Somerset House, reflect disgrace on the sordid government of this country, but not on its genius... a noble painting by the President WEST of *Christ teaching humility*... two admirable sculptures by FLAXMAN, and energetic pieces by Messrs. FUSELI, NORTHCOTE, and DAWE, incontestibly prove the existence of high talent, if any proof was wanting... It is

> insulting to the genius, the understanding, the patience, and wasted industry of the British people for government to plead necessity, while lazy noblemen and court-sycophant commoners meanly receive many thousands without giving a shilling's value in return. There never will be a public feeling for elevated art so long as the public is without a national establishment to improve taste, and its productive industry is wasted on titled boobies, time-serving commoners, and selfish ministerial schemes <12>.

By about the middle of his career with The Examiner, Hunt was apportioning more blame on the artists themselves rather than making the government his main target. In 1817 he commented:

> Considering that there are no less than 45 Painters who are members of the Academy, and a large number of other exhibitors, the thinking part of "the thinking people of England" might reasonably expect from so many Professors something more than they see of ambition in Art above the level, good as it is, of Portraiture. Every succeeding year adds but little, very little, often nothing, to the actual amount of historical attainment. The excuse derived from the badness of the times, the want of encouragement, the necessity of labouring to supply that financial blood-sucker, the tax-gatherer, and other such excuses, though perhaps admissible in part, do not afford a sufficient apology for the tardy advance of the higher walk of Painting; for it is one of the main properties of genius to triumph over difficulties in its unquenchable ardour for eminence: and the want of resolution to confront and combat them argues a dwarfishness of mind, a puerility of spirit, disowned and distained by true genius. If the public have not sufficient relish for high

Art to afford it due patronage, it becomes the duty, at least it ought to be the desire and endeavour of the great body of the Professors of Polite Art, to propagate, raise, and mature such a relish <13>.

In 1820 and in 1821 his opinions on the Royal Academy exhibition were somewhat more favourable, but in 1822 he thought its standard had dropped again and in the following year returned to blaming the Academicians:

The Exhibition opened last Monday under the auspices of brilliant weather, of the attractive smiles and genial power of Apollo from without and within the rooms of the Academy, but the latter in a much more restricted degree than the former, for the brilliancy of genius there shines among a large proportion of surrounding dulness. Its aggregate quantitiy is less than in former years, especially in the higher works of art. Out of 32 Royal Academicians and 18 Associates, there are but two who this year display any high power in Historic Art, and that after 55 years existence of the Academy <14>.

In 1825 an increase in the quality and number of history paintings exhibited at the Royal Academy led Hunt to take the most optimistic view that he had yet held, concerning the progress of the fine arts <15>. An optimistic attitude was the prevailing mood of his Royal Academy reviews for the next two years, but his final review for The Examiner in 1828 was again pessimistic, seeing no improvement, except in portraiture. In the previous year, feeling heartened by the quality of the exhibition, he had enumerated the foundation of the National Gallery, the patronage of Lords Stafford, Grosvenor, and de Tabley, the

purchase of the Elgin Marbles, and the interest of the press <16>, as all contributing to the improvement of the fine arts in Britain:

> The knowledge in art so successfully commenced in the middle of the last century by the examples and precepts of BARRY, BANKS, BACON, HOGARTH, REYNOLDS, WEST, WILSON, and other British artists, and extended by our annual exhibitions, and those of the Lords STAFFORD, and GROSVENOR, and the additional impulse given to native talent in the respect shewn to it by Sir J. LEICESTER (now Lord DE TABLEY) in forming a gallery exclusively of British art, together with the purchase of the Phidian Sculptures, &c. the establishment lately of a National Gallery of paintings, and the attention bestowed by the press upon the arts, - with all these circumstances, nourished by the general enlargement of mind and intellectual improvement, have at length issued such an emulative and advanced condition of art, as to promise not merely a respectable continuance, but a high character. The improved exhibition of the Academy last year, and now still better one of this, have more especially widened the vista, and opened this pleasant prospect <17>.

It will be observed then, that while Hunt's views on the pre-eminent importance of history painting remained fairly constant throughout his career, his attitude towards the Royal Academy and his opinions on the progress of the fine arts changed. The views expressed by Taylor on these matters, as we have noted, were static - for thirty years he saw the arts as advancing and the Royal Academy as a contributory force in their progress.

While Hunt found room to air political opinions in the space of his fine arts column, there was less opportunity for doing so in an

exhibition review than in, say, a more general article on the fine arts. With regard to his Royal Academy review, it was usually his initial instalment where he most clearly linked his political beliefs with his views on the fine arts: in the other instalments, politics had a tendency to creep in now and again *en passant*, most often as some comment concerned with the subject of a painting. For instance in 1816, Hunt found much to admire in Allan's *Circassian Chief selling his Captives to a Turkish Pasha* for the moral it expressed was in keeping with his anti-slavery sentiments <18>. In 1812 the inclusion of *A Medallion of Cribb, the British Champion* in the exhibition, allowed him to voice his disapproval of boxing. The Professors of Art 'ought to avoid an acquaintance with and encouragement of every thing that vulgarizes the mind and brutalizes the feelings, the inevitable consequences of the vile pursuit of pugilism' he asserted <19>. Generally though, it was portraiture which provided the best opportunity for side-tracking into politics, religion and the like, in the form of puffs (or their opposites) for the individuals portrayed. Thus we find Hunt puffing Lord Grosvenor:

> For their look of life, we admire MR. PHILLIPS'S *Earl Spencer, Mrs. W Russel*...and MR. JACKSON'S *Mr. Carter*... &c.; and would have made a bow of respect to *Lord Grosvenor* for his parliamentary wisdom and integrity, were we not admonished by the frames that they were but painted resemblances <20>.

Or deprecating William Pitt:

> Mr. WESTMACOTT'S *Model of a Statue, to be cast in bronze, of the late Mr. Pitt*, has much nobleness of attitude, dress, and anatomical science. But Mr. Pitt, with his high, domineering, aristocratical look, rigid

face, long neck, and lanky limbs, has the most unfavourable face and figure possible for a senatorial statue. Mr. WESTMACOTT has done wonders with it <21>.

In this respect Hunt was typical of most reviewers throughout the period, who took the opportunity of passing comment on the personages represented, when reviewing portraits. Usually, the comments were of the mildly sycophantic kind: 'the truly noble Marquis of Stafford', 'that justly popular poet Lord Byron', 'the scientific Sir J Banks', 'that spirited actress Miss Stanley' and so on <22> - the review serving the purpose of complimenting the sitter as much as, and sometimes rather than, trying to assess the merits of the artist. When this was the case, the artist was invariably praised too, since otherwise there would have been the implied insult to the person represented that he or she had made a bad choice of artist when commissioning the portrait. Taylor, as we have noticed, usually devoted a large proportion of his review each year to portraits, and because he was by nature a habitual flatterer, puffs were a notable feature of many of his critiques. His review of Hoppner's portrait of *Mr. Pitt* (Pl.15) neatly demonstrates the political bias of the Sun, as well as Taylor's obligation to compliment the artist as a form of compliment to the recently deceased subject. The comparison with Van Dyck is to indicate that the portrait has attained that standard of excellence by which all portraits should be judged, although its actual resemblance with paintings by this artist is superficial, if at all:

> The pre-eminent subject of this Portrait entitles it to pre-eminent notice. It is an excellent likeness of the illustrious original, and strikingly expresses the firmness and penetration which were

essential Features of his character. There is a sober dignity in the whole of this Picture, which is more in the style of VANDYKE than of any other Artist, if it may not, indeed, be said to be rather in the true style of nature and truth <23>.

It was commonplace throughout the period for Van Dyck to be used as the yard-stick by which portraits were to be measured, but it is often hard to gauge the extent to which such comparisons simply represented a compliment to the artist (and indirectly, to the sitter) or were meant quite seriously. Hunt, who was in many respects a thoughtful and well-informed critic used the comparison with what appears to be the most genuine of motives. In a Royal Academy instalment devoted solely to portraiture in 1813, he pointed out the advantage of using a standard of comparison when trying to convey visual ideas with only a verbal means at his disposal. For this reason, he explained:

> I shall... fix a standard by which to estimate the principal portraits in the Exhibition, and it shall be nothing less than the two first Portrait-painters among the Old Masters, - TITIAN and VANDYKE, - for I can venture to assert with truth, that however the Old Masters in a point or two surpassed in some degree the Painters of the present day, the comparison will be by no means invidious, when it will be found that some of the latter have nearly equalled them, or at least obtained eminence even in those points which most distinguished TITIAN and VANDYKE, - the colouring, ease, and dignity of the former, and the exquisite drawing, pencilling, energy, and elevated feeling of the latter <24>.

In the same instalment, therefore, we find Hunt comparing the 'colouring or TITIAN'S flesh' with that of Thomas Phillips and the 'drawing,

pencilling, energy, and tasteful colour of VANDYKE' with that of William Owen. When, on other occasions, he suggested that Lawrence's portraits rivalled and even exceeded those of Van Dyck, we must take him in all earnestness:

> Vandyck has been called the 'Prince of Portrait Painters.' Mr. Lawrence we think may fairly dispute with him the palm of excellence. His drawing, execution, and colouring, are equally spirited and rich with Vandyck, except in minutiae of touch and carefulness of finish, while he exhibits more grace in his females <25>.

> Sir T. LAWRENCE has been, on the whole, always head of his branch of the Fine Arts, and to the retaining if not improving all his former elegance of composition, action, and character, has progressively added such beautiful pencilling, in its union of finishing and freedom, as to stand in all his united excellence perhaps superior to VANDYKE himself <26>.

Taylor often used Reynolds, in addition to Van Dyck, as a measure of excellence in portraiture <27>, which was in keeping with his overall unctuousness towards the Royal Academy, referring to the former president on one occasion as 'the great father of the modern school of portrait-painting' <28>. Hunt's attitude to Reynolds however, was more complex. He seemed to show a degree of admiration for Reynolds' portraits, as well as sentiments which were in accordance with Reynolds' ideas concerning the possibility of elevating portraiture by associating it with aspects of the Grand Style. In his fourth Discourse Reynolds had stated:

It may be asserted, that the great style is always more or less contaminated by any meaner mixture. But it happens in a few instances, that the lower may be improved by borrowing from the grand. Thus if a portrait-painter is desirous to raise and improve his subject he has no other means than by approaching it to a general idea <29>.

In 1828 Hunt, reiterating Reynolds, stated:

As portraiture is very justly pronounced to degrade historical art, so, on the contrary, a portion of the spirit of historical art introduced into portraiture, raises and refines it <30>.

Likewise in 1816 he had declared:

Of genuine Portraiture there are two kinds, that which shews us shape and complexion, and is the result of a correct eye, and that which gives the physiognomy of the mind, and is drawn from an impression of individual character, or from the more ideal sources of fancy. A union of these two kinds is the rare perfection of Portrait Painting. GIORGIONE and TITIAN combined them. Sir J. REYNOLDS and MR. ROMNEY were distinguished for their union, and among our immediate Painters, Sir. T. LAWRENCE. Thus if he paints a lady, whose condition and whose accomplishments of taste and manners are productive of refinement of character, he pourtrays that refinement... If it is man of genius, his work describes in the air and look, -

"The internal pow'rs active and strong

"And feelingly alive to each fine impluse" <31>.

And, in 1819, similar sentiments were expressed:

The class of Portraiture has had a great diminution of interest this

season from the absence of Sir T. LAWRENCE'S pencil, which has been the only one in the Exhibition since REYNOLDS'S, materially connecting it with subjects of higher importance....none of our Painters have given a poetical cast of thought to portraits like Sir. T LAWRENCE. For instance, there have been no exaltations of individual resemblance like his *Kemble* as *Rolla* [(Pl.20)], or his *Lady Leicester* as *Hope* [(Pl.21)], from SPENSER <32>

On another occasion, Hunt invoked the authority of Reynolds' 'admirable Discourses', when criticising the figures in the works of R R Reinagle, which were:

True to Nature in every respect, except a degree of marble-like smoothness and hardness, such as Sir J. REYNOLDS mentions in his admirable Discourses, when condemning the too great softening in of the outline with its ground as producing the above-mentioned defect, the reverse of VANDYKE'S delicate sharpness of outline <33>.

But a number of Hunt's other references to Reynolds contradict his principles rather than affirm them. For instance: 'The pleasing and novel effect of a quantity of strong blue in the dress of the charming *Portrait of the Marchioness Wellesley*, J. P. DAVIS, disproves SIR J. REYNOLDS'S theory respecting the necessity of having the chief object in warm colour <34>. (As Gainsborough's famous *Blue Boy* had also set out to disprove).

On two other occasions, Hunt revealed a more serious objection to Reynolds' ideas. The first was during the course of a detailed criticism of Turner's *The Decline of the Carthaginian Empire* (Pl.22). Hunt thought that Turner's picture demonstrated the 'too general adoption of Reynolds' lax principles', and declared that Landseer's

'excellent Discourses at the Royal Institution, and a few of our best Artists in their practice, have sufficiently shewn the heresy of these principles against the pure faith inculcated by the every-where Nature' <35>.

The second occasion was a particularly extended passage, questioning the authority of Reynolds' Discourses, which formed part of Hunt's 1827 Royal Academy review:

> Reynolds... in his Discourses as well as practice, lays too much stress upon the leading parts, and upon general effect, at the expense and to the rejection of detail; whereas detail is a great beauty in a portrait as well as in nature; and the leading constituents and general effect never need be neglected, and are not in the least deteriorated by the adoption of that beauty to a certain extent. It increases its value, by giving it a character of verisimilitude. Portraiture should undoubtedly be elevated in character as much as possible, by means of great breadth of light, shade, and colour, by graceful or noble attitudes and action, except in *particular* persons in vulgar life (for grace is not inconsistent with, but is often seen in humble life) by the select elegance of all the shapes, by the easy flow of the outlines, of the dress, &c. By some of these, or the like means, the peasants of OSTADE and of MURILLO are a superior order of beings to (while equally natural with) those of NETSCHER and BRAUWER. The fact, indeed, is, that this nicety of detail much contributes to the popularity of Sir T. LAWRENCE, so that had he the texture, the more natural grain seen in the flesh of Sir J. REYNOLDS' best portraits, he would reach a point nearer to the perfection of nature than that painter, for he would

unite the mental and the mechanical, the ideal and the obvious and usual, more completely, so as to aid portraiture as he does, with some of the importance of the higher departments of painting, while further marking its identity with familiar life, to which it belongs <36>.

This, and the previously quoted passage may be seen as representative of a body of dissenting views against a number of Reynolds' principles, which had been accumulating since the late eighteenth century, and which after the acquisition of the Elgin Marbles grew with increasing momentum. Such dissent revolved around Reynolds' views on the ideal, and on generalised and particular nature: it was the argument that the Marbles, far from being generalised forms were, in Hazlitt's famous phrase, 'precisely like casts taken from life' <37> which provided one of the pieces of amunition against Reynolds' authority. The gradual erosion of the principles which had been articulated by Reynolds can also be seen in the wider context of the social changes which accompanied industrialisation: the assumptions underlying academic theory and the notion of painting as a liberal art as Reynolds perceived it, was based on a distinction between private and public virtue which was increasingly irrelevant to commercial society. Owing to the accessibility of his writings, much scholarship has naturally focussed on Hazlitt's refutation of Reynolds' principles as an example of this process, and Barrell's analysis of Hazlitt's 1816 Encyclopaedia Britannica article points to the essence of Hazlitt's arguments concerning generalised and particular nature. For Hazlitt, there were two extremes of style: that which consisted of giving no detail and that which consisted in giving nothing else. The true style was not the mean

between these two extremes (as Hazlitt had interpreted some of Reynolds' arguments), but their union:

> The utmost grandeur of outline, and the broadest masses of light and shade, are perfectly compatible with the utmost minuteness and delicacy of detail, as may be seen in nature...Nature contains both large and small parts, both masses and details; and the same may be said of the most perfect works of art <38>.

Haydon too voiced similar arguments, and Barrell has suggested that both Haydon's and Hazlitt's beliefs may have had their origins in ideas expressed in Barry's Inquiry into the Real and Imaginary Obstructions to the Acquisition of the Arts in England (1775), <39>. Hazlitt's arguments, including some further points concerning portraiture in the Encylopaedia article <40> certainly show similarities with the opinions expressed by Hunt in his 1827 exhibition review. While it would be too hasty to ascribe Hunt's views to any such exact source (although it should be pointed out that Hazlitt was friendly with the Hunts), his objections to Reynolds' views on generalised nature do at least serve to demonstrate how contemporary debates on aesthetics and the theory of painting, could enter the language and criteria used by exhibition reviewers. Hunt, being an artist, as well as an art critic, was presumably interested in current theories in painting and aesthetics *per se*, but the opinions he expressed in his reviews (especially those which were directed towards specific paintings) may well have guided non-specialist reviewers, and thus it is possible to see how a chain of influences could lead to the gradual breakdown of the critical norms which had been adopted and established by eighteenth-century journalist critics. Critics like Hunt, who commanded sufficient textual space for

occasionally entering into abstract discussion during the course of their exhibition reviews, might be credited with having played a greater role in changing the norms of taste during the first couple of decades of the nineteenth century, than the critics whose aesthetic values were merely implied by their comments on newly exhibited works, though never pronounced. However, the latter, precisely because of the tacit nature of their values, perhaps exerted an even more potent force on the general public which, in matters of aesthetic judgement, was probably more susceptible to the type of guidance which told it what to like, rather than why.

While Hunt's exhibition reviews reveal some of the influences of contemporary theory (in addition to the use of well-established theories), Taylor's demonstrate the reverse: his critical criteria and his vocabulary remained almost constant thoughout his career. He rarely developed his own theoretical arguments during the course of his reviews (the nature of his preferred layout was of course, not conducive to any protracted discussion) and his overt references to art theory and theorists were not only rare, but usually very slight (Hunt, did not mention very many theorists by name during the course of his exhibition reviews either, but he did venture into abstract discussion more). Examples of Taylor's references to theorists include one occasion, when by way of compliment, he mentioned that Hoppner's portrait of *Grenville* (Pl.23), as well as being an exact likeness, had 'that ideal excellence which was so often inculcated by the late admirable President [Reynolds]' (41). Another occasion when he made a fleeting reference to Edmund Burke, in a rather light-hearted manner:

Mr. BURKE says, that *obscurity* is one of the sources of *the sublime*;

and, upon this principle, the *back grounds* of this Artist [Lawrence] are entitled to rank in that style. For our part, though we do not wish for minute exactness, we like to see something intelligibly *made out*, according to the phrase <42>.

And, a brief mention of Lavater, in order to assist an 'inversed-puff' of a portrait of *T Holcroft, Esq.* (Pl.24) (by Opie), and not to present a serious consideration of theories of physiognomy:

If this be, as we are informed, a Portrait of a Writer whose *Politics* are better known than his *Person*, we are suprised that he should not distain to be *dubbed an Esquire*, as such an addition shews, what must appear to him, a bigotted attachment to unmeaning *ranks* and *titles*. The Portrait is painted with great spirit, and with a clear manly tone of colour. The likeness is said to be exact, and, if so, LAVATER would hardly be able to discover in the countenance a modest degree of self-estimation, or a meek toleration of the opinions of others <43>.

Although Taylor did not discuss theories, a set of implied precepts or critical criteria guided his criticism. These critical criteria were mostly taken from the principles of traditional academic theory, but it is virtually impossible to locate the influence of specific authors in his writings (except in the case of Reynolds, who, as has just been noted, was mentioned by name) since the principles were used only in their most simple form and could have come from any number of writers. For this reason one might assume that Taylor had read Du Fresnoy's poem The Art of Painting, being perhaps the most concise and most accessible expression of the principles on which his criticism was based and a work which had enjoyed some popularity in England throughout the eighteenth

century: it had been rendered into English by various translators, annotated by De Piles and Reynolds, and had enjoyed several editions by the time Taylor began his career. Reynolds' Discourses presumably exerted an influence, and it is possible that Taylor had even heard them delivered, but this seems unlikely as he does not refer to them in his autobiography. He does say that he once dined with Sir Joshua (soon after the publication of Burke's Reflections on the French Revolution in 1790) <44> which suggests that had he been a witness to the famous annual prize-day speeches of the first President of the Royal Academy, he would have dropped in a word or two about it, whilst on the topic. We do know though, that Taylor did attend other lectures at the Royal Academy (given his connections with this institution, this would be hardly surprising), and evidence that he attended Turner's lectures on Perspective has already been discussed <45>. In so far as his criticisms display neither an in-depth knowledge of any particular theorist and hardly any perceptible changes in critical criteria or vocabulary over the years, it is simply impossible to know how well-read or how learned he was in matters pertaining to the fine arts. It has already been suggested that Taylor's artist friends probably played an influential role in educating him in the fine arts, and it is just possible that, with the exception of his attendance at the Royal Academy lectures (which, for a journalist, may have been more for their value as social gatherings, than for any other reason), most of Taylor's theoretical knowledge was gained second-hand, through conversation. In fact, a familiarity with some of the other journalistic criticism which was being written at the time Taylor began his career, probably would have served him well enough.

While we can certainly assume that Hunt was more conversant with the literature of art theory, a large number of the statements in his exhibition reviews, like those of Taylor, employed the basic principles of academic theory in a very general and diluted way. As will be discussed below, sometimes his remarks on individual works of art made use of other types of response unconnected with academic theory, but this was usually in his more detailed critiques. This, in addition to his greater use of abstract discussion, (rather than directing all his remarks towards specific works of art), had the effect of making his reviews more complex and more interesting. Nevertheless, the concepts which were derived from well-established academic theory guided most of his critical judgements and formed a substantial part of his review each year.

Since Taylor's reviews were generally void of complex argument, we can in fact summarise his critical criteria and vocabulary. His most frequent remarks concerned colouring or tints, correctness of drawing, mechanical dexterity, execution, finishing, design, composition, (he once mentioned ordonnance) outline, conception (it seems that he did not employ the term invention, which might be considered as synonymous, and which formed a principal division of academic theory), the grouping or disposition of figures, expression, the distribution of lights and shadows, the gradation of distances and colours, breadth, harmony or the effect of the painting as a whole, the resemblance with nature, and the attitudes and likenesses of figures depicted in portraits. The core of his vocabulary of approval (very little of his criticism was disapproving) can be enumerated in a list of approximately fifty words in their adjectival form, (for thus the majority of them were most

commonly employed): accurate, admirable, animated, beautiful, bold, charming, chaste, classical, clear, correct, delightful, delicate, dignified, easy, elegant, exact, faithful, fine, firm, forcible, free, fresh, graceful, grand, harmonious, ideal, interesting, judicious, light, luxuriant, manly, masterly, natural, neat, picturesque, pleasing, poetical, pure, rich, simple, sober, soft, spirited, striking, strong, sublime, sweet, truthful, unaffected, vigorous, vivid, and warm <46>. In addition, 'well arranged', 'well dispersed', 'well contrasted', 'well disposed', and 'well distributed' were used to described lights, drapery, and figures. Sometimes Taylor's vocabulary of disapproval (see below) was used in the negative, particularly 'not gaudy'. Some adjectives were applied to many different technical qualities: obviously, the more vague the word, the more applications it could have. Therefore, 'pleasing' or 'beautiful' for instance, could be applied to colouring, composition, expression and other qualities. Certain adjectives were associated mainly with one particular quality: for instance, it was colouring which was invariably chaste (as was the case with other critics). Sometimes Taylor revealed a penchant for using the same two words in conjunction with each other: J Keenan's *Portrait of Earl St. Vincent* (Pl.25) was 'painted with firmness and a manly simplicity of colouring' <47>; H Howard's *Portrait of H Tresham* was 'painted with firmness and in a manly tone of colouring' <48>; and 'the outline of the figure' in Sir W Beechey's *Portrait of the Duke of Cumberland* (Pl.26) was 'firm and manly' <49> (It has already been noted how Taylor was particularly fond of the adjectives 'firm' and 'manly'). Likewise, colouring was not only often described as 'chaste', but 'chaste, yet vivid' <50>, and 'rich, but not gaudy' <51>. This way of

playing opposite adjectives off against one another (as in the second and third examples) was a characteristic which Taylor shared with most other critics and is given further consideration below. Taylor's positive vocabulary changed little over a period of thirty years.

Taylor's vocabulary of disapproval comprised: the above vocabulary in its opposite form - incorrect, unpleasing, affected, undignified and so on; the above vocabulary, expressed as an excess - too strong, too vivid, and so on (sometimes, but less often, as a deficiency - not delicate enough, insufficiently contrasted, and so on); and, a small additional vocabulary, which comprised antonyms of his positive vocabulary, and some new concepts - careless, coarse, cold, dingy, dull, extravagant, gaudy, glaring, indeterminate, negligent, obscure, rough, slovenly, stiff, tame, theatrical, wild, vulgar <52>. As he much less commonly gave out adverse criticism, most of these words were used rarely, and some of them were used only once in his entire career. For instance, it was Turner's *'A Country Blacksmith disputing...* (Pl.4) which provoked Taylor into complaining about the 'slovenly unfinished character' <53> of the work. This word had not featured in his reviews before, and it never appeared again, so perhaps Taylor was momentarily picking up a growing trend among other critics for criticising lack of finish with words which were heavily loaded with moral implications <54>. It is true to state that Taylor's negative criticism relied somewhat less on set formulae and stock phrases than his positive criticism, which was the case with most critics, including Hunt. One reason for this, in Taylor's case, was because his adverse comments were more usually directed towards works in genres other than portraiture: works which were intrinsically more interesting, and which, owing to the

developments in British art at this time, were more challenging to the norms of taste. Another reason perhaps was the fact that academic theory had tended to stress what the artist *ought* to do, therefore there was a greater precedent of vocabulary for describing good qualities, rather than bad ones.

It has been remarked how Taylor's reviews lack evidence of the influence of contemporary debates in art theory (there is some suggestion of associationist ideas in his response to landscapes, but associationism and picturesque theories were hardly new, by the time Taylor had reached the end of his career). For whatever reasons, (it has been suggested the pressure of keeping the Sun going), Taylor's reviews became little more than lists of the major exhibits after 1820, but one might ask, had he continued to have written detailed reviews up to the end of his career (1825), would he have held on to his original criteria and vocabulary. It is true that up to a point, he had pre-determined the perimeters of his response by the very nature of his criteria and vocabulary: the former were simply directed towards a finite number of technical and painterly qualities, and the latter was essentially an eighteenth and even pre-eighteenth century language intended to evoke negative or positive features of these technical qualities <55>. Had he wanted to stay within these limits he probably would have found it possible to do so. However, it is also true that such terms of judgement were becoming increasingly inappropriate for the art being produced. The world was changing and, as we have already noted with Hunt's criticisms of Reynolds, old authorities were being challenged. Other critics were using new words and writing criticism which employed new types of response. The new devotees of art had

different expectations to those Taylor had learnt to have, and the readers of periodicals were beginning to want something different from journalist art critics than that sort of art criticism Taylor had learnt to write <56>.

When considering both Taylor's and Hunt's art criticism, there is one overriding factor which coloured the nature of both their responses and which should not be overlooked. Each held on to a belief in the hierarchy of genres - Taylor, in spite of omitting to mention the deficiency of history painting in the Royal Academy exhibitions. Therefore, when they judged works of art in lower genres, they did so with the academic hierarchy at the back of their minds, and an accepted assumption that such genres did not represent the proper and elevated end of art. Indeed, the principles of academic theory on which their main critical criteria rested had been based on this assumption. While, Hunt frequently declared his feelings about the supreme value of history painting, Taylor was less ostentatious about it (naturally it sat uncomfortably against his ingratiating remarks concerning the Royal Academy). Hence, it was only an implied concept, to which he referred when criticising works in lower genres. Thus, for instance, although his review of Thomas Daniell's *North-East View of Sezincote* in 1818 contains very high praise, it is remarked that the work is only a 'beautiful picture, and one of the chief ornaments of the room, *within its province of art* [my italics] <57>. Similarly, we find Taylor declaring of Lawrence's portrait of the *Hon. Lady Hood in 1808*: 'It manifests truth of principle and the grandeur of the art, *so far as it can be shewn in the province of Portrait*' [my italics] <58>.

In 1818 Taylor noted: 'A great improvement has taken place in the representation of domestic and familiar subjects <59>, but his appreciation of these subjects never fell into the raptures of delight in detail and narrative content which characterised the remarks of some critics, especially some of the younger generation reviewers who had abandoned the notion that art ought to have more lofty aims <60>. Even, Hunt for all his high mindedness about history painting was so entranced with Rippingille's *The Post Office* (Pl.27) that he declared, 'This picture is alone worth going to the Exhibition to see' and devoted thirty-five lines to relating the characters and incidents portrayed <61>. Taylor, got less involved in such works, partly because his format did not really allow for long descriptions of the scenes and stories, but also, one senses, because he did not think the subject matter important enough to enter into an extensive account. This is not to say that the subject matter was insignificant altogether - as we shall see, it was important that the work contained some engaging incidents and provided an interesting vehicle for displaying variety of expression. As was the case with most critics, because scenes of familiar life were associated with the Flemish school, and the Flemish school was noted for its 'high finishing', Taylor looked for finesse of execution and the ability to make the scene convincing with penetrating observations on human character and behaviour. Taylor's comments on Wilkie for instance, while often showing an appreciation of the artist's ability in depicting variety of expression and character (a concept which basically derived from academic theory), showed that in the subjects which were Wilkie's chosen field, 'accurate observation', 'neatness of execution', 'mechanical dexterity' were the points for

which to look (explaining why he found Turner's *A Country Blacksmith...* so unacceptable in terms of 'finish', although several other reviewers found much to admire in this work <62>). Wilkie's *Village Politicians* (Pl.28) possessed a 'remarkable neatness in the execution' <63>, his *Blind Fiddler* (Pl.5) showed 'great mechanical dexterity' <64> and his *Card Players* (Pl.29) was 'another striking proof of extraordinary skill and observation in a young artist who has in a short time raised himself to the top of *that province* of painting in which his talents are exercised' [my italics again] <65>. In 1818, Taylor questioned the subject matter of Wilkie's *Errand Boy* (Pl.30), which caused him to remark: 'His mechanical skill entitles him to admiration, but it is to be regretted that that skill is not always employed on subjects of adequate interest... the incident is of no importance, and it is difficult to ascertain the meaning and object in view. Such, however, as the subject is, it is treated admirably' <66>. He obviously felt that while mechanical dexterity and accurate observation were the qualities to look for in domestic and familiar scenes, such qualities in themselves did not make a picture. As Reynolds had stated in his fourth Discourse 'It is but poor eloquence which only shews that the orator can talk. Words should be employed as a means, not as an end' <67> A nagging suspicion at the back of Taylor's mind (because of what he read, or discussed with his artist friends) was the idea that an artist who painted solely to show off his technical merits was deserting the true end of painting, that of exalting the mind. Even when his chosen genre was not history painting, if he aimed towards higher things he could ennoble his art. While Reynolds had admitted that a good performance in a lower style could be preferable to a mediocre performance in the grand

style <68> his advice to the young artist, (and at thirty-three in 1818, Wilkie was still relatively young) had been to aim high: 'Having begun by aiming at better things, if from particular inclination or from the taste of the time and place he lives in, or from necessity, or from failure in the highest attempts, he is obliged to descend lower, he will bring into the lower sphere of art a grandeur of composition and character, that will raise and ennoble his works far above their natural rank' <69>.

In their response to landscape painting, both Taylor and Hunt drew a distinction between Poetical and Familiar landscapes (paintings of local scenery). In the latter, described by many critics, including Taylor and Hunt, as 'portraits of nature', verisimilitude was a more important criterion than in the former. In the former, the painter was permitted to exercise his imagination, but only, as we shall see, up to a degree - he could not afford to be 'negligent', 'obscure' or 'careless' in his handling (Taylor's expressions) or 'generalise his forms too much' (Hunt's usual complaint). The different types of landscape were expected to have different effects on the spectator. While it seems that the latter *could* work on the spectator's imagination via the memory in order to produce some of the pleasant associations of nature, the former was positively expected to raise ideas in his imagination - ideas and feelings which were of no common sort, but were associated with grandeur, the sublime and other such elevated concepts. This notion obviously had links with associationist ideas which undoubtedly affected the critical response to landscape painting from the late eighteenth century onwards <70>. In the way that portraiture could be raised by introducing elements of the Grand style, so too, was Familiar landscape

capable of incorporating aspects of the Poetic. Turner's *Carnarvon Castle*, although a picture of a specific locality, possessed such qualities, and was highly admired by Taylor, who commented:

> Mr. TURNER possesses a true poetical spirit, and can give to the ordinary scenes of Nature an air of grandeur and beauty that makes its way immediately to the imagination of the spectator <71>.

Likewise, Hunt found that Collin's *Dartmouth* associated 'the beautiful with a feeling somewhat more exalted' <72>. However, landscapes which portrayed nature's outward appearance only, were not, according to Taylor, permitted to deviate from representing actual scenes. So, for instance, he did not approve of Constable's *Landscape: a Study* because the artist had strayed from 'truth':

> We are not... fond of what is stiled a *study*, or a *composition*, in the province of [familiar] landscape. Perhaps we judge fastidiously, but we certainly prefer *truth* on all occasions, and therefore should rather have admired some scene of local nature, to which we are sure that the Artist would have given an interesting aspect. It is different in works connected with poetic fable, or historical record, and in these the Artist, by exercising his own imagination, may forcibly operate on the imagination and passions of the spectator <73>.

It is an interesting exercise to examine a few of Taylor's remarks towards specific landscape painters, as a demonstration of those problems of methodology to which this dissertation draws attention. As it has been noted that the use of reviews to seek out the response towards particular artists and works of art has a tendency to take their statements at face value and overlook the motives and other influences

which affected the critics, Taylor's reviews provide a useful illustration of this.

We have already noted that Taylor's reviews of Callcott for instance, seemed not to coincide with his true feelings, and it has been suggested that a lack of confidence, along with a willingness to give puffs, allowed Taylor to be swayed by the opinions of others: this may have been particularly so in the case of landscape painting, which perhaps more than any other genre was undergoing developments not wholly reconcilable with traditional aesthetic values. It is also possible that Taylor's views on landscape, while they may have been influenced by his artist friends, were moulded by general sentiments which were being bandied about in the press world. As well as this, we have to take into account the possibility of the influence of personal contacts and other motives unconnected with aesthetic criteria. For instance, his first review of Callcott was *A Sea Coast, with Figures: Bargaining for Fish* (Pl.31): a painting which had been bought by Sir John Leicester, and a fact noted in the Sun's critique. The picture was reviewed favourably, perhaps simply because it would have been unpatriotic to have done otherwise under such circumstances.

Most of Taylor's reviews of Turner's works were either a mixture of praise and adverse criticism, or wholly unfavourable until 1811 (with the exception of *Sun Rising through Vapour*, 1807 (Pl.18), which was reviewed entirely favourably). From then onwards, until Taylor's departure from the Sun, the reviews are all entirely favourable. Turner's correspondence with Taylor in the year 1811 has already been noted (74). Could it be that Taylor and Turner became personally acquainted in this year, thus causing Taylor to write warmer reviews?

In Records of My Life, Taylor remarked of Dr. Wolcot (a great favourite of his), that:

> It was a settled point with him never in the slightest degree to attack those whom he had before satirized, after he became at all acquainted with them. On the contrary, when he became acquainted with the ingenious Mrs. Cosway, whom he had ridiculed in his "Odes to Painters", he changed the tone of his lyre, and wrote some elegant verses in praise of her talents and personal worth <75>.

One can be sure that, given his temperament, Taylor admired such behaviour and would have emulated it.

On the other hand, a glance through Butlin and Joll's catalogue <76>, reveals that the press response to many of Turner's works throughout his career was characterised by a diversity of opinion and often much puzzlement. Taylor's reviews prior to 1811, show that while he could appreciate Turner's 'genius' and skill in conveying effects, his handling worried him, as did his lack of attention to detail, and the fact that he seemed to be setting a new style which was having a pernicious effect on other young artists. The words 'careless', 'extravagant', 'affectation' and 'obscurity' appeared in his reviews, in addition to the implication that Turner had not truly achieved 'grandeur' or 'the sublime', but merely given an impression of them.

> ...his desire of giving a *free touch* to the objects he represents, betrays him into *carelessness* and *obscurity*, so that we hardly ever see a firm determined outline in any thing he does. This negligence appears like *affectation* rather than *grandeur* <77>. [*Dutch Boats in a Gale* (Pl.32)]

As this Artist seems anxious to be the founder of *a new style* of painting, and as he has already some followers, it is the more necessary to animadvert on his productions. It must be acknowledged that he possesses a considerable portion of genius, but it must be acknowledged also that he is in danger of being betrayed into the *false-sublime*... There is an appearance of grandeur in this picture, but there is much that is extravagant and obscure...<78>. [*The Tenth Plague of Egypt* (Pl.33)]

As this Picture is likely to attract much notice, and as the peculiar manner of this Artist seems to be gaining ground in the profession, we attend to it thus early. It affords a striking specimen of the merits and defects of the Artist, and is indeed a lamentable proof of genius losing itself in affectation and absurdity. Under the idea of *generalizing* his objects, he often produces nothing but incongruity and confusion...<79>. [*Callais Pier with French Poissards* (Pl.34)]

We have before entered our protest against the *new style* which this Artist is labouring to bring forward, and which has already done much mischief among Students who have not sense enough to look for simplicity and grandeur...<80>. [*Boats Carrying out Anchors and Cables to Dutch Men of War* (Pl.35)]

Such comments however were not unique to the Sun. The Star stated that *The Army of the Medes destroyed in the Desert by a Whirlwind* (1801) was 'a masterly sketch' but that there was 'much trick in the execution' <81> and The Monthly Mirror remarked of *the Tenth Plague of Egypt* that

it *aspired* 'to the ideal imitation of Nature', but that there was 'a false as well as true sublime' and that both presented the 'same surface to the first glances of the eye'. Nevertheless, it considered the merits of Turner's picture to be 'many and great' <82>. Although Taylor seems to have changed his tune after 1811 and looked on Turner more favourably, the pictures which were given detailed reviews by the Sun, (*Mercury and Hersé* (Pl.19), *Frosty Morning* (Pl.36), *Raby Castle* (Pl.37), *Dort or Dordrecht* (Pl.38), *The Field of Waterloo* (Pl.39)) received good reviews in other periodicals, and as far as one can judge from the criticisms located by Bultin and Joll, were well received overall, with the exception of the last which divided the press into two extremes <83>. In the end, whether we can conclude much from Taylor's reaction to Turner's works remains doubtful, except that his comments formed part of what was in any case a heterogeneous response from the contemporary press, and may have been influenced by personal contacts.

Taylor's response to Constable is similarly somewhat unhelpful. He ignored the artist until 1817, suggesting that he either thought him insignificant, could not make up his mind, or avoided him because he did not want to publish adverse criticism. In 1817, well into Constable's career, Taylor briefly mentioned his landscapes which he considered were 'painted with truth and spirit' <84> and in the following year, he provided his only detailed criticisms of Constable's works. With the exception of his complaints concerning *Landscape: a Study*, already noted, his attitude towards Constable was sympathetic. However, Ivy notes that in this year the critics were 'essentially well-disposed' towards Constable, so Taylor may have just been toeing the usual press line. On the other hand, we have evidence suggesting that it was

personal motives again, which may have induced him to write in terms which were generally favourable towards Constable. Taylor was acquainted with Constable's father-in-law, Charles Bicknell, and it has been suggested by previous scholars that a conversation between Bicknell, Taylor and Farington, which took place in the month prior to Taylor's first notice of Constable, and in which Farington spoke of Constable in high terms, influenced Taylor to notice the artist's work favourably <85>. In view of this it is relevant to point out that further evidence suggests that the artist and Taylor eventually became acquainted, since the list of subscribers to Taylor's collection of poems published in 1827 included the artist <86>.

The above examples illustrate how difficult it is, when examining Taylor's responses to individual artists, to arrive at satisfactory interpretations. Remarks which read as statements of aesthetic judgement may sometimes have been written with other functions in mind. Nevertheless, as our earlier comments revealed, Taylor's writings do embrace some basic abstract principles such as an adherence to the hierarchy of genres and an application of the main rules of traditional academic theory. Taylor (and certainly other journalist art critics of his generation) then, wrote criticisms which were the outcome of a mixture of motives and influences. These can be reduced to three predominating components: the desire to give good (or bad) publicity to artists and the subjects of portraits for a wide variety of reasons unconnected with aesthetic rules (eg. political and personal motives); the influence of other journalist art criticism, especially on occasions when a concensus of press opinion appears to accumulate and set a precedent; and finally, the contraints and limits caused by the

employment of the basic principles of academic theory and its accompanying vocabulary as the main method or vehicle of appreciation <87>.

With regard to Taylor's exhibition reviews, a few further points might be made concerning the effects of these three influences. Concerning the first, it should be noted that the artist acquaintances cited in Taylor's autobiography <88> enjoyed prominence in his Royal Academy exhibition reviews: Farington, Lawrence, Beechey, West, Opie, Shee, and Bourgeois. That all these artists were Royal Academicians hardly needs to be pointed out, nor the fact that many of the other artists who enjoyed regular reviews in the Sun were R.A.s or A.R.A.s. Given Taylor's political outlook and sentiments towards this institution, and his predisposition towards giving puffs, none of this is particularly surprising. With regard to portraiture, without a doubt, Taylor was especially influenced in the choice of which works he reviewed, by the sitters portrayed. Indeed, he even went so far as to declare the higher value which he placed on the thoughts and emotions induced by contemplating the character and achievements of the person represented, than the sentiments which might arise from contemplating the work of art's aesthetic qualities:

> This is a picture which must afford a *higher* pleasure to every British spectator than any that could arise from it as a *mere* work of art, however excellent. The gallant Defender of Acre has added to the military renown of our Country, and the Portrait of such a man must, of course, impress the mind with a gratifying sense of national pride [*Portrait of Sir Sidney Smith* by R K Porter (Pl.40)] <89> [my italics].

A higher gratification than that which a contemplation of the works of Genius produces, must arise form the consideration that is employed on subjects which deserve public attention and respect. Such is the case in the present instance. The character of the estimable original of this Portrait is known to the world at large by the high talents, extensive learning, and an impartial and enlightened execution of the important office he holds [*Portrait of the Right Hon. Sir W Scott* by Hoppner] <90>.

Portraits of those who have distinguished themselves in the service of their country, and in a profession that must often expose them to imminent danger, and the most disastrous termination of mortal existence, are always subjects of peculiar interest, and appeal to much higher emotions than those connected with mere critical taste [*Portrait of Rear-Admiral Sir D Milne* by Raeburn {Pl.41}] <91>.

With regard to the second of the influences outlined above, it has to be stated that the general press response to any particular artist could undoubtedly have an accumulative effect: it could result in the stereotyping of artists and the repeated bandying about of certain phrases and descriptions (Ivy's collection of Constable criticisms illustrates instances of this). How much Taylor was influenced by his fellow reviewers in this respect would be difficult to determine until more studies like Ivy's (which examine the entire cross-section of response to a particular artist) have been undertaken. As Ivy points out, reviewers openly copied from one another, and for instance, although it is of little significance with regard to their critical

responses, the repeated punning of Constable's name is a case in point. Taylor, who as we know had a weakness for puns, could not resist the temptation in his first detailed review of one of Constable's exhibits in 1818. 'The picture has greater truth and merit than more ostentatious works, and if we may venture a pun, we may say, that few will "out-run the *Constable*" (92) he rather predictably declared, using a pun which had been invented at least six years earlier (93).

Turning to consider the third of the influences, the fact that Taylor expressed his reaction to new works of art through the medium of quite a narrow and virtually unchanging vocabulary and a predetermined set of critical criteria throughout his career, had, as has already been suggested, a restricting effect on his perceptions. Nevertheless, such perameters did not prevent him from accommodating views which were sometimes sympathetic to works of art which by the standards of other critics were too innovative or challenging. It has already been noted, for example, how he admired Turner's *The Field of Waterloo* (Pl.39) (for whatever reasons) which received a hostile response from other journalist critics. Along similar lines, it is interesting to note that his terms of judgment seem to have accommodated a remarkable egalitarianism when it came to the matter of assessing the work of women artists. On one occasion, (allowing for the characteristic pun, if intentional) he described Mrs. Cosway's *The Birth of the Thames* (Pl.42) as 'the genuine offspring of a poetical mind' (94) and by suggesting that the feminine intellect was capable of poetic thought was surely close to suggesting that some women at least, who were thus so accomplished, had a place in society beyond the mere confines of the domestic sphere. On another occasion Taylor used a masculine expression

of admiration for the college depicted in Mrs Long's *View from the Bridge of St. John's, Cambridge* which was described as being 'in a masterly style' <95>. Perhaps it was because Taylor put less value on the role of the fine arts in society than Hunt, that he was able to use such terms of appreciation in assessing the works of women artists.

Hunt was not unduly condescending towards women artists when he was assessing their exhibits in his Royal Academy reviews <96>, but nevertheless one gets the impression that he was only able to rank women alongside men, as artists in the lower genres (the genres in which women generally worked anyway). In terms of his ethic, the fine arts were imbued with moral and political significance, and their progress bound up with the progress of society as a whole. Therefore, his perception of the artist, as a participant in these important processes, was essentially a masculine one. Hence, we find him alluding to 'the masculine and tasteful minds of our leading artists' <97> on one occasion when his overall assessment of the Royal Academy exhibition was generally favourable, and describing Etty's *The Combat* (PL.43) as possessing 'high principles and masculine powers of drawing, composition, colour and expression' <98> in his 1825 review. In the following year, commenting again on Etty, who in this year exhibited *The Choice of Paris* (Pl.44), he commented:

> It is a subject of difficulties; but our ambitious Painter has conquered nearly all with his masculine powers, for it not only provokes comparison with some fine old pictures - having been a favourite and frequent subject - but its large masses of flesh-colour and many naked figures, demand great knowledge of the human form and its various tintings and character <99>.

In keeping with such use of language, it has been pointed out by Hemingway that Hunt's obituary of Angelica Kauffmann was 'largely dismissive'. The obituary stated:

> In poetry, painting and musical composition, its best strength has been adequate only to display the gentler feelings of the human heart <100>.

Before making some concluding comments on Hunt's reviews, it should be stressed that in spite of certain differences, the two critics had much in common. It has been noted that Hunt adopted a format which allowed him greater freedom than Taylor: his more discursive and less formulaic approach meant that he used a wider vocabulary and made more sophisticated critical judgements. Nevertheless, as we have already touched on, his basic critical criteria were very similar to those of Taylor, as was his vocabulary. While the latter is too extensive and complex to enumerate in a list, it can at least be compared with Taylor's: Appendix V tabulates the findings. It shows that the vocabulary which Hunt used in his Royal Academy reviews sampled at five yearly intervals throughout his career embraces all of Taylor's core vocabulary with the exception of 'picturesque' and 'ideal': a finding which is certainly interesting, if somewhat puzzling. Were these words unpopular with Hunt because they were perhaps capable of too many interpretations - an indication of the seriousness with which he pursued his task of exhibition reviewer? Not only do the years sampled in Appendix V show the complete absence of the adjective 'picturesque', but a search through all of Hunt's Royal Academy reviews suggests a positive avoidance, for the word appears to have been used only once, not in any sense which suggested that Hunt expected the reader to understand it as an important and complex pictorial concept, but somewhat informally, to

describe the Highland Dress of the subject of a portrait - as if the word was already beginning to enter into the vernacular <101>. Taylor, on the other hand, used 'picturesque' fairly frequently, not only, as one would expect, with reference to landscape paintings, but also in his critiques of portraits (often in conjunction with the adjective 'poetical') to describe painterly phenomena such as 'style' (of painting) <102>. It seems likely then, that Hunt was deliberately steering clear of the use of the adjective 'picturesque' as an art-critical term because it had become a hackneyed expression among other journalist art critics (and anyone else who wanted to sound learned about art), or, because he was only too aware of its more complex theoretical associations. It seems very likely too, that he had been influenced by Landseer's Lectures at the Royal Institution which were published in 1807, the year before he began his career with The Examiner (and, as far as we know at present, his career as an art critic). It must be remembered that Hunt had trained as an engraver, so would have had a particular interest in the lectures (to which he refers on a couple of occasions in his Royal Academy reviews <103>). In his third lecture, Landseer discusses a number of art terms, but expresses an objection to the word 'picturesque' because it only suggests the known powers of artistic endeavour, rather than their potential. He only gives the term consideration because 'it is at present so fashionably technical in almost all conversations respecting Art, that something would seem wanting, were I entirely to omit noticing it in this place' and states that he does not forsee having much occasion for using it during the course of the lectures (a positive avoidance like Hunt), his explanation implying that not only was the word somewhat vacuous, but

that it had become so meaningless, there was no point persisting in using it: 'having once chosen to admit this Foreign termination into your language, you may... frame the term *sculpturesque*, or *Woolletesque*, or almost any other *esque* you please' <104>

The adjective 'ideal' although absent from the samples taken for the purposes of compiling Appendix V, did appear a few times in Hunt's Royal Academy reviews: during the refutation of Reynolds' Discourses, already quoted, and on at least five other occasions <105>. On the last of these occasions Hunt felt the need to clarify his use of the word, lest his readers might interpret it in a higher sense than he intended:

> *Cupid and Psyche.* Mr. WESTALL has here been engaged in that species of subject which best suits his powers, - that ideal species, which has beauty of countenance and elegance of body and mind. We say ideal, not in that high sense which embodies the purity, the fancy, and the nature of the great Painters of the Continent, but of that which is compounded of good and bad, of a manner peculiar to himself not in nature, and of beauty and feeling that are in nature; - such as that, in comparison with poetry, for instance, partly constituted the set manner, the mixed merit and defect of Pope <106>.

Two of the other occasions when 'ideal' appeared in Hunt's reviews however, seem to indicate a usage which implied that it was more or less a synonym of 'poetic' (i.e. that which pertained to the imagination): 'No other painter [Fuseli] has ever transported our imaginations so fervidly and so far into the obscure and awful regions of ideal and supernatural existence' (10 May 1812); Stothard 'looks at and delights in the sunshine of morals and of visible nature, thinks of the felicities of life, contemplates Elysium, and feasts our eyes and our

hearts, with happy realities and ideal delights (18 May 1817). 'Poetic' and 'Poetical' were used by Hunt with some frequency, and it may be that 'ideal' was not particularly popular with him because of a preference for this alternative, which was no more than an insignificant quirk of his personal vocabulary. On the other hand, his infrequent use of 'ideal' suggests a sensitivity towards the variety of meaning it was capable of having which like 'picturesque' made it at once very complex, but ultimately rather ambiguous. (Hopefully, future research, by studying the individual writings of other critics in this way, will reach a stage where it will be possible to unravel idiosyncracies and general trends with greater certainty, and to gain some understanding of the degree to which critics were trying to convey precise and meaningful concepts, or were simply employing what had become an easily imitated jargon <107>).

Although Hunt's and Taylor's vocabulary had much in common (Hunt's 1813 Royal Academy review for instance, used forty out of the fifty-two words which formed the basis of Taylor's vocabulary), Hunt's reviews are notable for making more use of certain technical words. I have located only one occasion when Taylor used 'tout ensemble' <108>, whereas Hunt used it with some regularity, along with 'chiaroscuro' or 'clare obscure' and 'carnations'. As concepts, these were not alien to Taylor, but he referred to them as 'the effect of the painting as a whole' or its 'harmony', more usually than 'tout ensemble'; 'lights and shades' or 'lights and shadows', rather than chiaroscuro; and 'flesh tints' or the 'complexion' of figures, rather than the 'carnations' (although all reds might be subsumed under this latter term, it most often implied those tints used in the flesh). He quite often commented on 'lights' and

'shades', but much more rarely remarked on the success of the artist in portraying flesh. In portraits he usually commented on the colouring of the whole work as one concept, which presumably included the flesh tones.

Hunt's more technical vocabulary perhaps reflected his training as an artist. Against this however, is the fact that 'tout ensemble', 'chiaroscuro', and 'carnations' were used by many other critics, and by the time Hunt began his career, one suspects they had entered into fashionable parlance, as it seems 'picturesque' had done. Haydon, for one, attacked William Carey <109> for using the 'technical nonsense' of De Piles and specifically complained about the 'old cant term "carnations" <110>. In a pamphlet defending this attack however, Carey quoted some of Robert Hunt's reviews in The Examiner, among other writers <111>, and quite justifiably pointed out that the exhibition reviewer of Annals of the Fine Arts (the periodical in which Haydon had published his complaint) had also made use of the term <112>. In addition, Carey argued, the word 'carnation' was English 'not borrowed from De Piles, or any other French writer, being of Latin derivation, long in use before De Piles was born' <113>. While Carey failed to offer evidence in support of the final part of this statement, it was nevertheless true that 'carnation', even if, by that stage, it was suffering from over-use, had a precise and clear meaning. Furthermore, it could be found in the first alphabetically arranged English dictionary, Harris' Lexicon Technicum (1704) which, along with 'Painting and Sculpture' covered all manner of subjects including, 'Navigation and Sea Terms', 'Arithmetick and Algebra', 'Chymystry', and 'History' <114>. Harris' Lexicon Technicum defined 'claro-obscuro' too <115>, (which was,

of course, of Italian origin). The fact that the expression 'tout ensemble' entered into the English art critical vocabulary perhaps *did* have something to do with De Piles, for significantly, Dryden had left it in the French, in his published translation of Du Fresnoy (1695) <116>, and it was not given in Harris' Lexicon Technicum. That none of these words was as problematic, or as open to multifold interpretation as 'picturesque', was perhaps the most important consideration, when it came to Hunt's use of them. What may be of more significance, is the absence of 'carnations' and 'chiaroscuro' in Taylor's reviews: an example of the layman critic self-consciously avoiding affectation, perhaps.

If the critic of the Sun had a tendency to adopt the voice of the layman, the persona of The Examiner's critic was interesting because it changed during the course of Hunt's career. Were Hunt's reviews not signed, one might even have suspected a change of critic, thus confirming the importance of tracing the identities of critics. During his first seven years of reviewing the Royal Academy exhibition for The Examiner, Hunt frequently adopted the first person singular (in addition to the first-person plural): in his early reviews, especially, many of his statements were expressed in terms which in a very positive way declared them as personal opinions (e.g. 'I think...', 'I believe...'etc.). By 1812 or so this mode of expression had become less frequent, and the first-person singular was abandoned altogether after 1814 <117>. As in our newspaper 'leaders' today, the less personal first-person plural was by far the most favoured voice assumed by the periodical art critics of the early nineteenth century, (although the eighteenth-century correspondent-critics had sometimes used the first

person singular), thus Hunt was exceptional in using the first-person singular and in making his reviews such statements of personal conviction. His adoption of this tone was presumably the result of personal preference rather than editorial pressure, but it was in keeping with the youthful exuberance and whole-hearted certitude which characterised much of what was expressed in The Examiner during its early years (Robert Hunt might have been influenced by Leigh's drama reviews which also sometimes made use of the first person singular (118)). That he abandoned it, may have been connected with the fear of sole responsibility should any of the content of his Fine Arts column have become the subject of a libel prosecution, or it could have been simply an external manifestation of an unconscious change in the degree of conviction with which he held on to, and felt able to express, his opinions. In 1810, Hunt exhibited youthful confidence and high-mindednesss in a passage which defended his judgments as a newspaper critic:

> I am perpetually assailed by the resentments, the friendships, and the prejudices of many of those artists, who occasionally come under the animadversions of the *Examiner*. One condemns me for making invidious comparisons between one living artist and another, because it excites jealousy and wounds the feelings, and asserts that my comparisons should be made only with *former* artists. Another says, I am altogether mistaken because, forsooth, I wage war with some favourite error or one which he has not talent to mend. A third is alarmed for fear I should be instrumental in reducing to penury the industrious, and in many respects meritorious, though in others mistaken artist. By almost all I am reviled for occasionally

pointing out defects which all more or less partake of, and for praising excellencies in others, of which each individual is deficient. But the reformist in art must, like the reformist in politics, be content to raise a host of bitter enemies, and to be subject to the perpetual assault and battery of vanity, ignorance, and self-interest <119>.

This is a far cry from the tone adopted in the concluding instalment of his Royal Academy review, twelve years later:

In taking our leave till next year of the many able and in some instances noble exemplars of Painting and Sculpture in this annual Exhibition, we cannot avoid soliciting the indulgent consideration of the Professor, and the Critical Reader, for what may have been considered as errors in our opinions, on a subject where such a diversity of opinion, more or less, necessarily prevails; as well as for those positive errors, which we are not vain enough to suppose have not occurred <120>.

Or the use of 'in our humble judgment' <121> as a preface to a remark in his 1827 review.

Although Hunt's tone of voice decreased in fervency and conviction during the course of his career, so that he was even prepared to admit that he was capable of errors of judgment, he still held on to a view that his knowledge and expertise placed him above the common observer. So, for instance in the last year of his career with The Examiner he complained of the 'feeble drawing, and smooth and inadequately painted flesh' in Beechey's *Portrait as Flora*, but declared that it was 'a picture that will please the uninitiated many' for it possessed 'a general elegance of shape, action, dress, and a showy effect'. While he

considered that the 'uninitiated many' would also be pleased with Clint's *Miss Seymour*, he asserted that so would 'the more correctly criticising': they would be able to appreciate the picture for having 'what is not merely sparkling but solid in art' <122>.

Earlier in his career he had expressed similar sentiments in his comments on T Pocock's *Venus and Cupid*. It 'is what the eye unaccustomed to good pictures would pronounce pleasing, for it is graceful in the position of the figures and soft in its gradations; but it is mawkish, and hardly equals mediocrity, to the more intelligent' <123>. And, on another occasion he had recommended that the visitor to the exhibition should look at the sculpture before the paintings, because 'the majority are mere children in judging of Art, and children are always best pleased with what is gaudy. Those therefore who are not acknowledged judges, ought to look into the Model Academy first, before their eyes are debauched by that gay wanton of fancy, - colour' <124>. Although such an attitude might been seen as contrary to the liberal politics of The Examiner, in a way it was typical of the view point adopted by the reforming intelligentsia generally, whose strength to challenge the *status quo* lay precisely in its perception of itself as an intellectual elite.

Having received some training in art Hunt was perhaps justified in perceiving himself as above the ordinary spectator (although the necessity of a training in art as a preparation for judging pictures was, as has already been observed, a debated point throughout the period <125>) and it is true that he made more detailed references to named theorists during the course of his Royal Academy reviews than Taylor did: Reynolds and John Landseer (as already noted), Jonathan Richardson

<126>, and Hogarth <127>, thus suggesting the possession of a broader theoretical knowledge. However, considering that his Royal Academy reviews collected together represent a body of writing sufficiently large to form a small book, these references are infrequent. The reason for this is that during the course of his exhibition reviews, Hunt generally presented theoretical arguments as statements of fact: a manner of presentation which, from the point of view of the less knowledgeable reader was deceptive in its implications: it either gave the impression that such statements were universal and unchanging truths, therefore giving no recognition to the debatable and unfixed nature of aesthetic theory, or that the arguments were Hunt's own, therefore failing to acknowledge their derivation from past and contemporary theories. However, in so far as there was a tradition of presenting the principles of painting as though they were universal truths (particularly emphasised by the terse format in which they were expressed by Du Fresnoy), and most of Hunt's statements based on well-aired ideas, his presentation can be seen as simply following this precedent. In this way for instance, we find him explaining the term 'invention':

> This performance... possesses a considerable portion of that main excellence of the Sister Arts, Invention, which consists not only of originating ideas and incidents, but in giving to subjects previously presented to the artist mind a new energy, by his original style of exhibiting them, and by the force, propriety, and adaptation to his subject, with which he selects and arranges his objects <128>.

Or defining the differences between poetic and familiar landscape:

> The rejection of objects that are familiar to the eye by their universality, presenting the usual scenery of the farmer and the lordly landholder, and the adoption of such as give a deeper and more delighted tone to the imagination, raising it by their majesty and refining it by their elegance, are the elements of that noble species of Landscape Painting, which, separated from Landscape Portraiture, assumes the character of Poetry <129>.

However, as with other critics, by far the most frequent type of statement in Hunt's reviews was that which took a predetermined painterly or technical concept and applied to it various, and often interchangable adjectives (or sometimes other parts of speech, used in a descriptive sense) which were intended to convey the quality and effect of the concept. In briefer critiques particularly, which attempted to evoke the character of the work of art as a whole, rather than discuss its various parts in detail, some of the types of statement made by Hunt are virtually indistinguishable from those of Taylor.

For example, both critics might make use of the adjective 'masterly' in a variety of ways: to describe 'drawing', 'manner' or apply it to the whole work <130>. Hunt could be found discussing how one colour 'pleasingly' gradated into another, and Taylor might mention that the 'distances' in a certain painting were 'admirably gradated' or that the whole work was 'pleasing' <131>. One critic could mention that the 'pencilling and finishing' were 'firm and neat', while on another occasion the other would suggest that the 'general execution' was 'neat' or that a work was 'painted with a firm pencil and characterised by force' <132>. Both critics commented on how the 'attitudes' of figures were 'easy and graceful', and described the 'colouring' of pictures as

'harmonious' <133>, 'chaste, yet vivid', or 'chastely vivid' <134>. Taylor might apply the adjective 'forcible' to 'colouring', and Hunt might apply it to 'effect' <135>. A portrait could be praised for having 'a strong likeness' and 'a forcible and agreeable effect of light, shade, and colour' or for having 'a very exact and spirited likeness', 'a fine breadth of light' and 'great truth and clearness of colouring' <136>. Taylor may have commented on how the 'drapery' was 'well-arranged' and Hunt may have complimented an artist for 'his various draperies' which were 'tastefully adjusted and well characterised'. Taylor might remark that the 'figures' in a certain picture were 'well disposed and characteristically designed' <137>. A masculine portrait might have Hunt praising its 'manly and martial' 'look', or Taylor suggesting that 'the air' was 'martial without affectation' and that the 'colouring' was 'chaste' and 'manly'. While Hunt would comment on the 'rich and strong' 'chiaroscuro' exhibited in some paintings, Taylor would draw the reader's attention to the 'fine breadth of light and shadow' and the 'richness' of 'colouring' <138>. When Hunt talked of 'extraordinary vigour of chiaroscuro' Taylor talked of 'a bold breadth of shadow' <139>. The way in which 'dresses', 'draperies' and 'figures' were 'disposed' was freqently discussed <140>. Hunt could be found suggesting that a certain picture had 'splendid colour', while Taylor found another 'coloured with great splendour' <141>.

These are just a few random examples showing the extent to which Hunt and Taylor shared a common idiom - an idiom which, as has been suggested, defined certain limits of appreciation. As has already been noted, from the 1790s to the 1820s the Sun's Royal Academy reviews

rarely overstepped these limits. In contrast, Hunt's writings for The Examiner demonstrate that they could be transcended in a number of ways, especially on those occasions when he discussed a work of art in detail: by giving more attention to its parts, rather than applying the usual critical criteria to the work as a whole (e.g. instead of discussing say, the colouring as one concept, he could discuss its effect in various parts of the picture <142>); by describing and discussing the actual subject depicted <143>; by relating his critical criteria to the subject matter of the work more <144>; by trying to convey the visual effect of the work in a way which helped the reader begin to picture it (e.g. mentioning specific colours <145> or trying to describe its facture <146>); trying to evoke the emotional effect of the work <147>; and by recounting the narrative content of the work, if it had one <148>. As far as one is able to judge, given the current state of knowledge, these are ways in which Hunt's writings represent a transitional stage in the history of journalist art criticism.

Although in comparison with Taylor, Hunt wrote reviews which displayed a greater variety of response, a reiteration of the same words and types of phrases characterised his reviews, owing to a combination of the nature of his critical criteria and the large number of works on which he chose to comment. Hunt was aware that it was partly the nature of his literary genre (i.e. the exhibition review) which forced him into making brief judgments on a great number of works of art, which in turn forced him into repeating the same type of comments, instead of allowing him to make remarks which revealed the uniqueness of every work he reviewed:

Confined as to room as we necessarily are in our notices of works of

> Art, we are frequently under the necessity of adopting and repeating general terms that are rather comprehensive and applicable to every work of excellence, than specifically adapted to one <149>.

That his comments would have been more varied and more specific to each work of art had he been able to review a greater number of works in detail is undeniable, but this would have been partly the result of his entering into types of responses (such as examining the subject matter, explaining the narrative, describing the emotional impact of the work, or even deviating into political discussion) which were not necessarily connected with his main processes of critical assessment. The fact remained that Hunt's primary idiom and his most consciously employed terms of judgment were, like Taylor's, those critical criteria which ultimately rested on the principles of academic theory: principles which were not designed to examine the uniqueness of works of art, but were peculiarly calculated to determine their conformity to a set of rules. Hunt got very close to realising this when he noted that his repetition was the result of having to speak of 'synonimous [sic] features and principles of different performances', but he was unable to conceive of a method of critical judgment which did not rely on assessing these synonymous features. Thus, he again attributed the limits of his response and the necessity of repeating himself to a lack of space (which was partly true) although in retrospect we can also appreciate that his repetition was also a symptom of certain characteristics inherent in his method of judgment:

> We are sorry our limits allow us only to bestow upon it [Callcott's *View of Rotterdam* (Pl.45)] the usual general phrases of description that pictorial critics are obliged necessarily often to repeat, in

speaking of synonimous features and principles of different performances, such as the harmony and transparency of its colour, its excellent composition, its beautiful breadth and subdivisions, the judicious balancing of the chiaro-scuro, the unusual and vigorous tone and truth of its separate and component parts and the forcible and fascinating effect of the whole <150>.

It is an anachronism to suggest it, but in spite of such limits of space, had Hunt employed a critical method which would have stressed the uniqueness and novelty of works of art, rather than their conformity to rules, he would have found less cause for regret.

Chapter Five

The Critical Idiom

The case studies presented in Chapters Three and Four took as their subject two individuals who wrote for two separate periodicals. As a consequence, it was possible to demonstrate some of the ways in which different writers and differing contexts could affect the content of exhibition reviews. Nevertheless, it was concluded that, for all these differences, the reviews in both The Examiner and the Sun were characterised by strikingly similar types of statement. So, although their vehicles were at each end of the political spectrum and differed in many other respects, Hunt and Taylor shared the same language of appreciation (the limitations of which, in Hunt's case, seemed to have caused some conscious dissatisfaction). That this critical idiom was a powerful force, profoundly affecting the genesis and development of the exhibition review is the main argument of the present chapter. Some considerable weight therefore has been put on examining writings which pre-date the emergence of exhibition reviews because they show how certain characteristics of this critical idiom were already well-established and inevitably prone to set precedents. It seems that in exerting such a strong influence on expressive form, the critical idiom which was passed on to reviewers at once served to disguise the changing ideological content of reviews, as well as embodying a set of inherited ideologies which inevitably moulded the perceptions of critics.

Pointing perhaps to its restricted scope in terms of vocabulary and critical concepts, Hemingway has suggested that art criticism ca.1805-30 comprised 'a range of types of statement [which] were put together in

various combinations', such statements being 'drawn from the available discourses of academic theory, philosophical criticism, and increasingly art criticism itself (as the weight of precedent within this discourse accumulated), and applied in relation to particular works and particular views of the artistic scene and the social order' <1>. This study fully endorses such an assertion, although, as will be seen, it would suggest that because academic theory had been used in a variety of contexts prior to the emergence of journalist art criticism, it should be regarded as having provided not one, but a number of slightly different precedents.

The newspaper exhibition review, as we have stressed, was a completely new literary genre in England in the 1760s, but it inherited a mantle which only slipped away by degrees as the nineteenth century progressed. This mantle comprised various verbal and literary precedents all of which had served different ends, none matching this novel usage. It is suggested here, that because journalist exhibition reviewers drew on such precedents, the very novelty of what they were doing was never consciously realised by them, nor the fact that, in certain respects, the tools of their trade were perhaps not very well suited to their new purpose. Journalist reviewers from the earliest years onwards, failed to perceive that their remarks, from the reader's point of view, were neither very entertaining or interesting as a piece of prose, owing to the repetitive use of the same words and expressions <2>, nor very helpful in conveying any precise ideas of the actual appearance of the works to which they were applied - which is why the exhibition review remained for such a long period a somewhat unsatisfactory literary form (as Hunt had noted). On the other hand,

reviews were seen as an important part of periodical literature and were evidently popular reading, in spite of their inadequacies in these respects, and so it is essential that we try to uncover, what exactly it was that they did have to offer. It is almostly certainly true however, that the importance of Ruskin's Modern Painters lies partly in the fact that because he wrote with a mission in mind, Ruskin did have a clear idea of his function and also a nice appreciation of the needs of his readers, both of which contributed to his becoming *the* art critic of the nineteenth century.

In considering the precedents on which the first periodical art critics relied, it is important to distinguish their different functions. By far the most significant distinction is that they can be defined either as having served a production-orientated function (that is, they were concerned with discussing and giving advice on the process of making paintings) or a reception-orientated function (they prescribed methods of art-appreciation and furnished a language of appreciation). Thus we have a large literary precedent generally termed 'academic theory' which functioned both to establish painting as a liberal art and to instruct aspiring artists, and, a mixture of verbal and literary precedents derived from academic theory (a point to which we shall return) which were more connected with the activity of art-appreciation. These include the conversational conventions established by connoisseurs, written guides on connoisseurship, and the verbal traditions established by art dealers and auctioneers. Finally, we have another substantial literary precedent in those writings which form the discourse described by Hemingway as 'philosophical criticism'. It embraces a large number of works whose purpose was, within philosophical

or moral terms, to enquire into certain aesthetic questions such as the nature of beauty and taste, but unlike academic theory, did not necessarily consider the specific problems of the painter's or sculptor's art. Examples include the Third Earl of Shaftesbury's Characteristicks <3> and Lord Kames' Elements of Criticism <4> as well as the writings of Archibald Alison and Richard Payne Knight. The discourse of 'philosophical criticism' (particularly associationist ideas) has been examined in relation to the art critical writings of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries by Hemingway, Funnell, and Roberts, and has been shown to have permeated into those writings <5>. As the effect of this precedent has already been given some scholarly attention, it is those precedents provided by academic theory which form the main focus of this chapter. Indeed, it is undoubtedly true to state that, of the two discourses, it was academic theory which provided the most essential ingredient of journalist art criticism.

By the eighteenth century, theoretical writings on art stretching back to classical times, already formed a considerable body of literature. As the term 'academic theory' implies, from at least the time of the Italian Renaissance onwards, these theories had been closely linked with academies of painting. As has been mentioned, they served the dual purpose of ensuring that painting achieved the status of a liberal art and in laying out rules for making pictures. It is likely that a 'rule-making' ethic had been fostered because of the concern which early Italian treatises had with establishing the principles of linear perspective. However, by the end of the seventeenth century, after the foundation of the French Academy (1648), France was taking over as the primary force in stimulating debate in the field of art

theory which in the mean time had grown in compass. The conflict in France between the Poussinists and Rubenists created a fertile environment for the generation of ideas, and in addition the relative newness of the French Academy coupled with a growing concern in Britain about its own absence of an academy of painting meant that French art theory was particularly taken notice of in Britain. The degree of its influence is revealed not only by the extent to which French theories were published in English translation (the frequency with which editions of Du Fresnoy's Art of Painting appeared, 1695, 1716, 1750, 1754, 1769, 1783, 1809, 1811...<6> is testimony of this), but also by encyclopaedias and dictionaries, which indicate the prevalence of French ideas throughout the eighteenth century. For instance, Harris' Lexicon Techicum (already mentioned as the first alphabetically arranged English dictionary) which was published during the early years of the eighteenth century <7>, lists entirely French authors as recommended reading under its entry for 'Painting', including Felibien and Roland Freart; the Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, 1754-5 <8>; under its entry for 'Invention' explains the theories of Felibien and De Piles; and Chamber's Cyclopaedia, 1781 <9>, under its entry for 'Painting' refers to Du Fresnoy, Felibien, and Testlin.

A detailed analysis of the influence of French academic theory in Britain and the subsequent development of a British tradition of academic theory following the foundation of the Royal Academy is not the purpose of our present study: John Barrell's study of how such theories related to the discourse of civic humanism <10> serves to illustrate what a vast a topic this is and how difficult it would be at this stage in our understanding of periodical art criticism to correlate subtle

changes in art theory with changes in art criticism - we have already noted how Hunt's exhibition reviews demonstrated the influence of some of these changes (with regard to his adoption and refutation of certain ideas expounded in Reynolds' Discourses) and there is quite evidently much more to be done in this vein. However, it is important to see how the precedents on which the first exhibition reviewers drew, affected the nature of their remarks, and the most essential point on this matter is the fact that although academic theory had developed as a didactic discourse directed towards student artists (and therefore provided rules of production), it appears that most of the various forms of art-appreciation which existed prior to exhibition reviews (and which it has been suggested formed mainly verbal or conversational idioms) never developed their own distinct theoretical frameworks, but relied simply on converting these rules of making, into rules of judgement. As Barasch has succinctly put it:

> What was implicit in the sixteenth century - the transformation of art theoretical concepts into categories of criticism - became manifest in the late seventeenth century: rules became acknowledged criteria of judgement <11>.

So it seems that academic theory provided a language of visual or painterly effects which functioned in two contexts: in the discussion of the processes of making pictures, and, in criticising them.

In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries a short-lived literary genre made its appearance in England: the connoissieur's guide - represented by Aglionby's Three Dialogues <12> and Richardson's Two Discourses <13>. Although it has been suggested by Richard Woodfield <14> that the antecedents of these publications were courtly manuals and

art theoretical treatises, he quite rightly points out that these guides represent a distinct literary genre. In giving practical instruction in the art of connoisseurship or 'connoissance' as Richardson termed it, Richardson's and Aglionby's publications are virtually unique in the art-theoretical literature which preceded newspaper art criticism. True, subsequent publications which set out to define and set standards of taste were similar in outlook, but none of them so resembled instruction manuals, or took 'connoisseurship' so specifically as their subject. It is suggested here that the connoisseur's guide did not take off as a popular literary genre, not because there was a lack of aspiring connoisseurs or that subsequent literary forms provided substitutes, but because in actual fact they were superfluous: the aspiring connoisseur could always just as easily reach for a translation of Du Fresnoy's poem, find the basic principles of painting theory in a very terse and 'user friendly' form and apply them to paintings as rules of judgement. Indeed, Aglionby virtually recommended this, for according to his guide, connoisseurs were excused the detailed knowledge of such rules that artists were expected to have. He specifically stated that it was easier to be a judge of paintings than to execute them because it required 'only a Superficial knowledge of the first Principles of the Art' <15>. In his final Dialogue, when the 'friend' (i.e. student) asks: 'I think it would be a good work to inform us how we should Judge of Paintings, and distinguish the Good from the Bad; as also, to teach us how to know the different Hands and Manners of those great masters already extant', the 'traveller' (i.e. teacher) replies: 'To do that perfectly, would be a Work of great length, and perhaps, ingage me in the Secrets of the Art itself, to such a degree, as my

Discourse would be fit for none but *Painters* to read; therefore I shall not do that; but if a few Rules of Common Sense and Obvious Notions will suffice, as I believe they will, to make any one a Judge of Painting, I am content to give you that sort of Observations' <16>. He then goes on to give rules which are based on academic theory, therefore are essentially production-orientated, and are often even expressed as if the advice were being offered to a painter rather than a connoisseur, such as: for drapery, 'the best Rule is that your Drapery be in large Foldings, Noble and Simple....'<17>; for colouring, the most general rule is 'to manage your Colours, Lights, and Shadows, that the Bodies enlightened may appear by the Opposition of your shadows' <18> and so on.

It is true that Richardson put more emphasis than Aglionby on the different qualities needed for judging and for creating paintings, with statements such as: 'a Man may be a very good Painter and not a good *Connoisseur* in This Particular. To know, and distinguish Hands, and to be able to make a good Picture are very different Qualifications, and require a very different Turn of Thought, and both a particular Application' <19>, or a connoisseur 'must not only see, and Judge of the Thought of the Painter in what he Has done, but must know moreover what he Ought to have done' <20>. Such comments indicate the intention to establish connoisseurship as a distinct discipline, but it is of no small significance that Richardson still found it necessary to give consideration to 'the Goodness of a Picture as being done according to the Rules of the Art', and that despite his arguments which suggest a differentiation between the skills required for the art of connoisseurship and those required for making pictures, on the occasions

when he most clearly explains the rules and methods pertinent to connoisseurship (eg. the first Discourse pp27-30, pp48-49, pp54-55) they too are generally based on in the production-orientated rules which divided painting into distinct parts such as invention, expression, composition, colouring, and so on, and which provided the foundation for most academic theory.

Although at one level Aglionby's and Richardson's guides were superfluous, it would be wrong however, to underestimate their significance. Firstly, as they were published at a time when picture collecting and connoisseurship was just taking off in this country, they presumably did much to set the tone of the conversational idiom which must have developed as an accompaniment to such activities. Secondly, although Richardson's Two Discourses were, in their complete versions, published only once (compared with the many editions which Du Fresnoy's poem enjoyed), there is evidence that they retained some influence later in the eighteenth century: Louise Lippincott has asserted that Arthur Pond's career was in many respects an embodiment of Richardson's ideas <21>; Richardson helped to fire Reynolds' ambition <22>; the Dictionary of Arts and Sciences used the Two Discourses as the basis for its entry for 'Painting' in 1754 <23>; Sterne certainly found them significant enough to bother to make them the subject of a satire in Tristram Shandy in 1759 <24>.

Before continuing our argument, it is important to point out that the language of appreciation which grew out of academic theory fell into two distinct parts (as has already been touched on with our examination of Taylor's criticisms): critical criteria (i.e.'rules' translated into terms of judgement) and, what can only be somewhat unsatisfactory

described as a 'vocabulary of visual effect' (i.e. those qualifying words which usually took the form of adjectives). It is true that the writings of academic theory had a part to play in providing both of these, but it is also obvious that the latter would become more extensive and take on more importance in the context of appreciation. Our present problem really concerns the latter more than the former, for the rules of academic theory provided definable and, at one level, rather simple concepts, particularly once translated into critical criteria. If for instance we thumb through Harris' Lexicon Techicum again <25>, we can find definitions for such concepts as 'composition', 'drapery', 'attitudes', 'design', 'carnations' and 'claro-obscuro' and others. And, we find them too, in Fairholt's Dictionary of Terms in Art, published approximately a hundred and fifty years later in 1854 <26>. As Lipking has remarked concerning the theory of painting in Britain, in the eighteenth century:

> For the most part the doctrine of painting, or at least the words of that doctrine, stayed the same; the truisms of 1670 were the truisms of 1790 <27>.

This not say that such words remained entirely static in their definitions or, in the context of certain theoretical writings could not assume deep and complex meanings. On the contrary, of course, subtle shifts in meaning occurred - particularly as the changing values of nineteenth century society exerted an influence on artistic values - (one would only need to look at the entries in our two different dictionaries to see this <28>), and of course, some theoreticians explored the precise meanings of these words in great depth (as did, say, the various professors who delivered lectures at the Royal Academy

during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries <29>). (The words which defined the broad divisions of painting, like 'invention', 'composition' and so on, were naturally more susceptible to subtle variations in meaning, than those which defined more precise concepts like 'drapery', 'chiaro-scuro', and 'carnations'). Generally speaking however, in the context of art appreciation, such concepts were not defined by extended theoretical argument: they were simply stated as though universally understood, and their sense apparently suggested more by the adjectives which accompanied them than by any other means.

The language of appreciation seems to have originated primarily in attempts to describe the qualities of the old masters. These occurred in the reception-orientated writings of Aglionby and Richardson, as well as having been a adjunct to earlier writings which were more predominantly production-orientated. One obvious example of the latter would be 'The Judgment of Charles Alphonse du Fresnoy On the Works of the Principal and Best Painters of the Two Last Ages' which was appended to the first English translation of Du Fresnoy's The Art of Painting <30> It described qualities like Titian's 'strong and free' colouring, the folds of Julio Romano's draperies which were not 'great, easie nor natural', Giorgione's 'glowing and agreeable' colours and so on. A very similar passage occurs in Aglionby's Three Dialogues which outlines the characteristics of: the early Italians, 'there wanted a Spirit and Life, which their successors gave to their works...they had not likewise, that sweet union of their colours'; Andrea del Sarto, 'his colouring was the sweetest in the World, but their wants Strength and Spirit'; Rapheal de Urbin, 'was admirable for the easiness of Invention, Richness and Order in his Composition, Nature herself was overcome by his Colouring, he was

Judicious beyond measure, and proper to his Aptitudes...His particular Talent lay in Secret Graces'; Il Parmigiano, had 'Sweetness, Neatness, and Grace in his Figures'; Perino del Vaga, was 'a bold and strong Designer'; Michael Angelo, was 'the greatest Designer...his manner was Fierce, and almost savage, having nothing of the Graces of Raphael; Cavaliero Lanfranc, 'had a great Fire, and a noble Manner of Design and Colouring, but not always so Correct as he should be'; Pietro Berettini di Cortona, his 'Forms are very Correct, as having studed all the Antiques of Rome better than any Painter of his Age; Titian, was 'the best Colourer, perhaps, that ever was; he Designed likewise very well, but not very exactly; the Airs of his Heads for women and Children are admirable, and his Drapery loose and noble'; Veronese, 'painted with great Grace, and adorned his Figures with Beautiful Draperies, but his Composition was gross, and Invention poor, neither did he Design Correctly...his Colouring is exquisite; Tintoret, was 'faulty in his Design...Composition and Ornaments mean...Colouring very good; Rubens, had 'great Genius, much Fire and yet great softness; Vandike, 'surpassed him [Rubens] in the Dilicacy of Expressing true Flesh and Blood...though he did not Design with great Correction' <31>.

If we compare the qualifying words or adjectives in the above passage with the list of John Taylor's more commonly used words <32>, we find that the following are common to both: spirited (spirit), sweet, strong, admirable, easy (easiness), judicious, rich (richness), natural (nature), neat, graceful (grace), bold, correct, exact (exactly), beautiful and soft. Clearly some of the terminology used for describing pictures in the late and early nineteenth centuries had been well-established for a century or more, but to what extent Aglionby's

terminology meant the same as Taylor's, or to what extent either of them conveyed precise concepts, is a question to which we will have to return.

It has been suggested that Richardson's and Aglionby's writings were important in setting the tone of connoisseurship: they provided guidelines on how the connoisseur ought to carry out his 'science', and also gave examples of the sort of language which he might be expected to use. With regard to the former, Richardson's Two Discourses recommended quite a detailed methodology. It relied on taking the main concepts or divisions of academic theory (adding Handling, and Grace and Greatness to the more usual ones), and suggested that in looking at an individual work of art, the connoisseur should consider these concepts in the following order : Grace and Greatness, Invention, Expression, Composition, Colouring, Drawing, and Handling <33>. In a slightly more light-hearted way though, an alternative methodology was put forward: Roger de Piles 'Balance of Painters'. The Balance had originally been used by de Piles to compare the merits of the old masters by grading each artist according to a numerical scale in terms of composition, design, colouring and expression. De Piles had used the scale to assess the oeuvre of each master. Richardson, however, recommended that it might be applied to a single work <34>.

It has been suggested by Carol Gibson-Wood that the relative unpopularity of Richardson's Discourses (it has already been noted how they enjoyed only one edition) was because Richardson's methodology stressed the scientific nature of connoisseurship, and took away its mystique:

> Richardson argued that art criticism was a wholly rational exercise,

it had a systematic method, produced certain results, and would be most successfully practised by those capable of clear thinking. But eighteenth-century amateurs of painting, I would suggest, did not want to be told that they must above all be clear-headed and methodical, much less that "one man may be as good a judge as another". Such prosaic matter-of-factness destroyed both the image of the connoisseur as the tastefully opinionated aesthete, and the elitism of his status' (35).

However, it seems that not only may Gibson-Wood have over-emphasised the failure of Richardson's Two Discourses (or at least attributed their lack of editions to the wrong reasons), her perception of them as a threat to connoisseurs is probably misleading.

This brings us to a most important point. That the language of art appreciation which existed prior to the emergence of the exhibition review functioned not only in a variety of contexts, by also at a variety of levels. Looked at retrospectively, from the historian's point of view, it is incredibly difficult to unravel, to what extent this language functioned as a mere jargon and to what extent it served as a legitimate means of describing visual phenomena for which normal everyday language was inadequate.

Indeed, one of the earliest examples of the language and vocabulary of appreciation in English, is from a hostile point of view - Evelyn's translation of Roland Freart's An Idea of the Perfection of Painting (1668). In discussing the importance of decorum in works of art, Freat's work complains that modern painters have neglected it and in its place substituted certain 'superficial beauties' for which they have invented 'a kind of Jargon and magnified Gibbrish':

As the Freshness and Grace of the Colouring; the Freeness of the pencill; the Bold Touches, the Colours well impasted and nourished; the Separation of the Masses; the Draperies well cast; the rare folds; the Master-strokes, the Grand Maniere, the Muscles thoroughly felt; the noble contours; Sweet Complexion; Tender Carnations; Handsome Groupes and Morcells and a thousand other Chymaerical beauties of this Nature, which doubtless were never so much as once heard of amongst the Works of the old Painters <36>

With perhaps some slight changes of fashion, the gibberish Freart complained of was standard art critical terminology for the exhibition reviewers who wrote in periodicals from the late eighteenth century to well into the nineteenth (again comparing some of the terminology used in this passage with Taylor's most commonly employed adjectives, we find 'fresh', 'grace[full]', 'free', 'bold', 'master[ly]', 'grand' and 'sweet' in common <37>. Curiously, less than a few pages after his complaint however, Freart found it unavoidable to use much the same sort of language in order to convey some of the differences between the works of Michel Angelo and Raphael - to prove his argument that the former offended the rules of decorum while the latter observed them: Raphael's compositions had a 'generous' and 'free' invention and one of his shining talents was 'gracefulness'. He wrought after a 'sweeter' manner than Michel Angelo who had a certain 'affected hardness' in his designing and 'notched in the contoures' of his figures <38>. We can only explain his initial attack, if we interpret it as being directed not so much at the language itself, than at the manner in which it was used.

To demonstrate some of the characteristics and problems associated with a specialist language, a useful analogy can be found in that which accompanies wine-tasting. Since recognising and describing subtle gustatory experiences is essential to this profession, it has had to overcome the inadequacies of normal everyday language. It has done this not by evolving brand new words altogether, but by applying new meanings to existing words. Hence the reason why non-specialists often find the language of wine-tasters confusing, vague, or meaningless. One seemingly absurd term, at least - the adjective 'dry' - has in the context of wine-tasting become universally understood however, thus proving the legitimacy of such a specialist language (even though it would take much argument to convince a child that a certain wine was 'dry').

Interestingly, within the last decade or so, wine-making and wine-tasting have become increasingly scientific and precise. And, such is the degree of precision considered to be requisite by some nowadays, the trade has developed the use of 'flavour-wheels'. These devices are not dissimilar to painters' 'colour-wheels', and comprise three concentric circles divided up in the manner of a 'pie-chart'. In the centre of the chart are to be found words which describe general tastes, the middle tier is more specific, and the outer-ring very specific: so moving outwards, one might go from 'fruit' to 'melon', 'cooked fruit', 'tropical fruit' and so on, and then on from, say 'melon' to 'watermelon' or 'canteloupe'. The flavour-wheel for sparkling wines branches out into 104 terms in its outer ring and the one for still wines into 94. Some of these terms strike the non-wine-taster as pretty

bizarre, such as 'mousey', 'aspirin', 'wet concrete' and 'stale powdered milk', but

> to ensure that people in the industry are talking about the same thing, standard reference samples are carefully defined. 'Violet', for instance, is to be made by macerating petals from 10 crushed violets in a standard-sized glass of wine; 'grass, cut green' by shredding one 20mm blade of green grass; 'banana' uses one 10ml slice of fresh banana. 'Tar' is one drop of roofing tar, left in the wine overnight <39> (The reader may wonder - as does the author, who has yet to discover - how 'mousey' is achieved!)

Clearly, though many outsiders would doubt it, the wine-tasters of today have at their disposal a language for describing tastes which is precise, universally defined and meaningful (although, for various reasons, not all of them choose to use it, and it is still necessary for them to use less precisely defined words to describe characteristics other than taste).

Looked at from another point of view however, it is possible to see that in a certain social climate it might not be in the interests of wine-tasters to be 'scientific' at all, but rather to cultivate a mystique and a language which is deliberately vague and confusing to the outsider. In this way they have a weapon for preserving their identity as an elite group, for protecting their profession from being infiltrated by people from the wrong social class, and for wielding power over the 'ignorant' but wealthy wine drinkers who put trust in their expertise and advice <40>. Thus we can begin to see how a specialist language can function at a variety of levels, not simply as a

genuine substitute for the inadequacies of everyday language, but as a social or professional indicator.

Returning to the language of appreciation then, it is probably true to state that owing to its very nature, it was all too readily suited to the latter purpose. This indeed is suggested by a number of written satires and attacks which were directed towards superficial connoisseurs and corrupt dealers during the first half of the eighteenth century. In 1737, Hogarth's 'Brito-Phil' essay in the St.James's Evening Post complained of 'peddling Demi-Critics' who on the discovery of 'some little inaccuracy... without any regard to the more noble parts of a performance, (which they are totally ignorant of), with great satisfaction condemn the whole, as a bad or incorrect piece' <41>. In 1751, an ignorant connoisseur, Pallet the Painter' appeared in Smollet's Peregrine Pickle <42>. In 1759, Reynolds' first letter to The Idler complained of 'the cant of Criticism', and evoked the conversation of a connoisseur recently back from Italy with a fashionable vocabulary on the tip of his tongue. Stressing it seems, the connoisseurs' jargon as a verbal phenomenon particularly, Reynolds' connoisseur has 'his mouth full of nothing but the Grace of *Raffaelle*, the Purity of *Domenichino*, the Learning of *Poussin*, the Air of *Guido*, the Greatness of Taste of the *Charaches*, and the Sublimity and grand Contorno of *Michael Angelo*' <43>. In the same year, Reynolds' passage was used to comic effect in a famous satire of connoisseurship in Laurence Sterne's Tristram Shandy, whose connoisseur complains 'Tis a melancholy daub! my Lord... for there is nothing of the colouring of *Titian*, - the expression of *Rubens*, - the grace of *Raphael*, - the purity of *Dominichino*, - the *correggiescity* of *Correggio*, - the learning of *Poussin*, - the airs of *Guido*, - the taste

of the *Carrachi's*, - or the grand contour of *Angelo*' <44>. De Piles 'Balance of Painters' was also satirised by Sterne at the opening of Tristram, where Sterne measures his own work according to 'the painter's scale, divided into 20' and decides that 'the out-lines will turn out as 12, - the composition as 9, - the colouring as 6, - the expression 13 and a half, - and the design, - if I may be allowed...to understand my own *design*, and supposing absolute perfection in designing, to be as 20, - I think it cannot well fall short of 19' <45>.

These satires all point to the language of connoisseurs as a superficial and easily imitated jargon. That while the guides by Aglionby and more especially, by Richardson had had good intentions to promote connoisseurship as a learned and 'scientific' activity <46>, they encouraged rather a jargon which suited a certain social class. This class had no genuine need for a true specialist language, but found it expedient to have some lingiustic indicators which served to define themselves as an elite and to keep out the uninitiated. For such 'connoisseurs' the adjectives which formed the basis of their jargon had no need to act as codes for conveying precise visual qualities and so could become interchangable (although stock adjectives were stereotypically applied to the works of certain old masters). As the words themselves, not the qualities which they were meant to convey, were what mattered, they could simply enter *en masse* into a repertoire, and be extracted at random to indicate that the user was *au fait* with a fashionable art critical terminology.

Similarly, this terminology could be used by corrupt dealers, who wanted to sound learned about art, and to impress and confuse gullible and rich customers. Hogarth's 'Brito-Phil' essay conjures up exactly

such a scene: the potential purchaser exclaims 'That Grand *Venus* (as you are pleased to call it) has not beauty enough for the character of an *English* Cook-Maid', but the dealer replies:

> 'O L-d, Sir, I find you are no *Connoisseur* - That picture, I assure you, is in *Alesso Baldovinetto's* second and best manner, boldly painted, and truly sublime; the *contour* gracious; the air of the head in the high Greek Taste, and a most divine idea it is.' Then spitting on an obscure place and rubbing it with a dirty handkerchief, takes a skip to t'other end of the room, and screams out in raptures, - 'there's an amazing touch! A man should have this picture a twelve-month in his collection, before he can discover half its beauties.' (47)

The gentleman is so 'struck dumb' with this 'cant' that he gives a 'vast sum' for the picture and 'bestows a frame worth fifty pounds on a frightful thing, without the hard name on it not worth as many farthings'.

Evidence suggests that this jargon became so easy to imitate and so lacked the kind of rules which might betray solecisms that, despite its having perhaps initially served to preserve connoisseurs as a distinct social group, the reverse occurred: it actually became the means to social mobility. Writing in the year of the first public exhibition in this country, Oliver Goldsmith remarked:

> Painting is now become the sole object of fashionable care; the title of connoisseur in that art is at present the safest passport into every fashionable society; a well-timed shrug, an admiring attitude and one or two exotic tones of exclamation are sufficient qualification for men of low circumstances to curry favour (48).

However, it is suggested here, that along with these bogus 'connoisseurs' and 'dealers', there had always existed a few for whom a precise and meaningful terminology was a truly useful tool: young painters learning the techniques of their art and those collectors, dealers, auctioneers and true connoisseurs who were cultivating the science of recognising 'hands'. That the language of art appreciation both in its bogus and in its genuine form was primarily a verbal idiom cannot help the historian, but it also perhaps provides a clue as to what was inherently problematic about its nature, for whatever depth (or lack of depth) of meaning it carried, it was not a language which functioned separately from the experience of viewing the works of art themselves. Two pictures by Gawen Hamilton illustrate this point: *Sir James Thornhill showing his Poussin [Tancred and Erminia] to his Friends* and *A Conversation of Virtuosi at the Kings Armes* (Pls.46&47). The connoisseurs in both pictures are gathered together making elegant conversation - the elegant gesturing in *A Conversation of Virtuosi* is particularly striking, and although in some cases the poses are possibly based on pictorial precedent, the effect is to convey an atmosphere of intellectual refinement. But, they are not discoursing in the abstract: they are in the process of discussing particular works of art. In the case of *Sir James Thornhill showing his Poussin* we have a very clear idea of the type of conversation in which Sir James and his friends were indulging, since a discussion of the Poussin is used to demonstrate good connoisseurship during the course of Richardson's Two Discourses:

> The composition is unexceptionable: There are innumerable instances of beautiful contrasts; of this kind are the several characters of the persons (all of which are excellent in their several kinds) and

> the several habits...The various positions of the limbs in all the figures are also finely contrasted, and all together have a lovely effect; nor did I ever see a greater harmony, nor more art to produce it, in any picture of what master soever; whether as to the easy gradation from the principal to the subordinate parts, the connection of one with the other, by the degrees of the lights and shadows, and the tincts of the colours. And these too are good throughout; they are not glaring, as the subject, and the time of the story (which was after sun-set) requires: nor is the colouring like that of Titian, Corregio, Rubens, or those fine colourists; but it is warm and mellow, it is agreeable, and of a taste which none but a great man could fall into...The picture is highly finished...the drawing is firmly pronounced...And (to say all in one word) there is such a grace and greatness shines throughout, that it is one of the most desirable pictures we have yet seen <49>.

In the case of Richardson, who wanted to set up connoisseurship as a intellectual discipline, and who, in developing the science of recognising hands, certainly needed a truly workable specialist language, we should perhaps interpret this passage as being above the level of the sort jargon we might have found some of our bogus connoisseurs using. Even so, what becomes apparent is the fact that, whilst the qualifying words just quoted, if used in conjunction with the experience of viewing the picture (Pl.48) do indeed take on meanings which were absent when they were read as a piece of text, these meanings are only defined by the picture itself. In other words we understand 'beautiful contrasts', 'great harmony' 'warm and mellow colouring' not as abstract concepts, but as the visual phenomena demonstrated in

Poussin's picture. This reveals one of the prime problems of the critical idiom which grew up prior to exhibition reviews: the terminology it used was apparently defined by the pictures to which it was applied and not by any absolute criteria. This is why Hogarth's corrupt dealer could apply to any picture of doubtful quality, exactly the same sort of terminology which Richardson might have applied to his Poussin and sound convincing. It is obvious that such a language was open to abuse by sham connoisseurs and dishonest dealers, and even for those who had no sinister motives, was prone to misunderstanding.

With the emergence of the exhibition review, the extensive use of the language of art appreciation unaccompanied by the experience of viewing the works of art themselves, occurred for the first time. In such a context, a language which was already inherently problematic, could not fail to become even more so.

It is helpful to return to our analogy of wine-tasting for a moment. As the newspaper 'wine column' and the popularisation of wine drinking is a relatively recent phenomenon, some parallels with what occurred when art criticism began to appear in the press can perhaps be drawn. It has already been noted that wine-tasters nowadays have at their disposal a precisely defined terminology of tastes. For those tasters who choose to use it, it serves primarily as a aid to memory, (but as has been observed, it only covers one aspect of the process of wine appreciation, since smells and textures also have an important part to play). The wine journalist's task however is not simply to remember and compare these tastes and other qualities, but to attempt to convey them, through language, to the average newspaper reader with a relatively uneducated palate. At one level therefore, it matters little whether a

universally defined trade terminology exists or not, for the ordinary reader is unlikely to be familiar with it. The wine-columnist therefore uses a mixture of professional and personal vocabulary to try to make his remarks accessible. Divorced from the actual experience of tasting the wines themselves however, the language of the wine journalist seems to vary in the extent to which it is able to conjure up distinct gustatory experiences to the unknowledgeable reader. It might use adjectives which try to indicate tastes and smells like 'lemony and appley', 'raisiny-fruity', 'dry', 'tarry' and 'oaky'; adjectives which give some idea of texture 'soft', 'light', 'firm' and 'rich'; and adjectives which seem to convey style 'appealing and characterful', 'enticing', 'attractive' and 'elegant' <50>). As has been noted, among the first sort of adjectives one specialist word, 'dry', has achieved universal use and understanding: it has been accepted as a code for describing a quality far removed from its normal everyday usage and the non-specialist will probably be able to imagine this quality in the abstract. Some of the other words in the first and second categories do not, for the non-specialist function as codes as such, but do conjure up various associations, which vaguely suggest abstract qualities too. Many of the adjectives however, particularly those which fall into the third group, are not particularly successful in conveying any precise ideas which relate to drinking wine as it is experienced by those with uneducated palates. Some of them even overlap with the terminology of art criticism: either Hunt or Taylor might have used them for conveying painterly style (firm), colouring (rich), or the attitude of a sitter (elegant). The problem however, is that in their role as newspaper literature, these words are expected to act almost as substitutes for

the real experience of tasting or viewing, and of course they prove to be inadequate. In fact, it is evident that the more such words are used in this way, the more vague their meanings become. And, indeed, in relation to this, it may be no conicidence that the wine-tasting trade has developed a method of defining precise tastes at a time when journalist wine-writing is taking off, if the divorcing of the language from the experience itself tends to have this effect <51>.

We have seen that in Richardson's description of *Tancred and Erminia* his vocabulary was defined by the picture itself and it has been pointed out how as such, this sort of terminology was open to abuse and misunderstanding. However, it would be wrong not to point out that among those who needed such a specialist language, and who applied it regularly and consistently to the same kinds of visual effect, it could begin to take on abstract meanings (like the wine-tasting vocabulary does among professionals). In fact there is one piece of vital evidence which belongs to the period of this study which shows that by the second decade of the nineteenth century, for some users at least, the adjectives which seem to us, in retrospect, to be 'irritatingly vague and confusing' <52>, did convey some fairly precise concepts: Elmes' General Bibliographical Dictionary of the Fine Arts (1826), which was the first specialist dictionary of art to be published in English. In this work, adjectives like 'bold', 'airy', 'feeble', 'delicate' and 'elegant' are given definitions <53>. Without visual examples to assist them, it might be questioned whether these definitions in themselves do convey, to the uneducated, such concepts. Nevertheless, the very fact that the words were included in the dictionary must imply that among the knowledgeable, they did conjure up some distinct abstract qualities,

and were certainly more meaningful than a mere jargon. What this evidence does not tell us however, is how recent a development this may have been, or to what extent, this terminology even when used above the level of mere jargon, retained enduring meanings.

We have discussed some of the problems encountered in trying to discover the degree to which the vocabulary inherited by exhibition reviewers had been used previously to convey precise visual phenomena and it has been found that it functioned both as a jargon and perhaps also more legitimately as a specialist language. At this stage it would be difficult to try to interpret the remarks of the earliest reviewers within these terms, without perhaps knowing more about the identities of the reviewers themselves and their motives. However, it is also true to state that because the exhibition review initiated a discourse which necessarily functioned away from the images themselves, the distinction between jargon and specialist language, even to contemporaries, must have become increasingly blurred.

Since the contemporary value of the reviewers' adjectives as codes or symbols for certain visual phenomena has been brought into question by the above evidence, it might be worth considering whether we can extract other meanings or values from them. By pursuing this line of approach, it can be shown that the vocabulary of criticism, functioned (albeit unsuccessfully) not only as a language of visual effect, but that it embodied a number of sub-texts which served to reinforce or to contradict established cultural values. Indeed, given that the language of appreciation itself derived from academic theory, this was hardly surprising. Since the latter set out to raise painting to the status of liberal art and therefore assumed a moral position when it expressed the

rules by which that art ought to be executed, it was only natural that when these rules were adopted as criteria of judgement, they would tend to imbue the language of appreciation with a disguised moral significance. In his article '"Splashers", "Scrawlers", and "Plasterers": British Landscape Painting and the Language of Criticism' <54>, Sam Smiles has precisely hit on this point: that by employing metaphors which associated the facture of loosely handled landscape paintings with mechanical trades like plastering and building, critics were not simply conveying visual effect, but were consciously or unconsciously suggesting that the work of art (and by implication the artist) was offending against the rules of decorum. It might be pointed out, in the context of Smiles' findings, that the considerably more neutral term 'loose' was already an accepted term for describing handling <55> when, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries certain reviewers were using such words as 'crude', 'slovenly' and 'coarse', particularly to characterise the 'new manner' of landscape painting. That these words were favoured over the more neutral one, indicates the importance of scrutinising the adjectives which formed part of the reviewer's vocabulary in terms of their moral import.

We have already mentioned how it was not uncommon for a reviewer to apply the term 'performance' to a work of art and how it necessarily fused his aesthetic judgement with an evaluation of the artist himself <56>. Smiles has cited evidence from Farington's diary which shows how the moral character of an artist was often read in his handling of paint. Certainly, much evidence exists which demonstrates the decided blurring between the two concepts of 'manner' of painting and the 'manners' of the artist. One might add to those cited by Smiles,

Fuseli's observation, reported by Farington, that one of Lawrence's works was 'so refined that no one but a gentleman could have painted it' <57>, or a passage in Hunt's Royal Academy review in 1816, which clearly linked 'simplicity' as a desirable quality in both 'art' and 'manners and morals'. The criticism of its absence in one of Dawe's works is expressed in such a way as to make it difficult to entirely distinguish whether the fault lies in the man or the work.

> Mr. DAWE wants the great charm of simplicity, that attic, natural charm, without which art, as well as manners and morals, is generally affected and always incomplete <58>.

Later on, the issue became debated in the periodical press when Eagles, the exhibition reviewer of Blackwood's Magazine, was criticised for referring to Constable's 'conceited imbecility'. In defense, Eagles declared that it was 'wrong and unjust to the critic, to apply words *personally*' that were 'only meant in reference to works' <59>. Nevertheless, while the same critic showed more caution the following year and clearly linked his comments to Constable's work, not the man, his choice of the word 'impertinent' to describe its 'lights', surely could not have failed to have implied *something* about the artist <60>.

The repeated concern shown by critics that paintings should achieve the right balance between breadth and detail has been commented on by Smiles as part of his argument. In Robert Hunt's writings there are frequent examples. Sometimes, with paintings he admired, he evoked their success in this respect, by juxtaposing words which conveyed the two opposite concepts such as 'exact, but freely drawn' <61>, or 'careful freedom of pencil' <62>. When he suggested that Hofland's landscapes were 'the medium between the slovenliness of Mr. TURNER and

littleness of Mr. GLOVER <63>, as Smiles has suggested, we might read it in terms of all it implied concerning behaviour and intellect.

However, the right 'balance' was a concern of critics which was not only confined to breadth and detail. Many other concepts appear to have been perceived primarily in terms of opposing effects. Thus outline, for instance, should not be too 'hard' or 'edgy' nor be too 'blended' or too 'indistinct': 'excessive softness and blending of outline' <64>; 'The outline... wants in parts a little more blending and touchiness' <65>; 'The outlines are distinct, without the hardness of his former works' <66>; 'a wooliness of effect, from a want, perhaps, of some more decision of outline <67>. Or, colour, for example should not be too 'bright' or 'vivid' nor should it be too or 'dull': 'a sober richness of colour' <68>;'a chastened brightness of colour' <69>; 'bright but chastened' <70>. It has been remarked earlier in this study how critics frequently played off opposing adjectives against one another, not necessarily even applying them to painterly concepts such as outline or colour, but simply to the painting as a whole <71>. Examples drawn from Hunt's reviews include: 'Forcible without violence, delicate without tameness, rich without gaudiness, elegant without affectation' <72>. And, 'Forcible but not violent, cheerful but not glaring, broad, but sufficiently detailed, simple yet profound <73>. The idea of balance or harmony which is suggested by these examples can indeed be related to contemporary and inherited theories of painting. For instance, in his third lecture at the Royal Academy, Barry had stated:

> Every excellence borders upon some deformity - the simple upon the cold and inanimate; the bold and expressive upon the blustering and over-charged; and the graceful upon the *precieuse* and affected;

> and... the transitions from the one to the other consist in the imprudent and indiscreet application of the *poco pui* or *poco meno* <74>.

However, if there is some justification for interpreting accusations of 'slovenliness' and 'littleness' as in some way implicating grossness or small mindedness in the character of the artist, might not the failure to achieve the proper balance between some of these other concepts be also read in terms of behaviour or personality. A want of firm outline, for instance might suggest lack of resolve and certitude, while its opposite might suggest unyielding stubbornness. Or, colours which were overly bright or vivid could be associated with a love of the vulgar and superficial, and dull ones with dullness of intellect. (When applied to a portrait, the inference might even extend to its subject). Perhaps this is reading too much into the metaphors of critics, but certainly when one thinks of the 'balanced', rational, moderate, yet not unduly insensitive behaviour and character which, say, the novels of Jane Austen appear to advocate, it may not entirely inappropriate to suggest that such analogies functioned at least unconsciously. That Hunt actually drew the attention of his readers to the fact that paintings might be read in this way also, should not go unnoticed:

> Pictures are physiognomical features of their Painters' minds. Thus this performance, like all this amiable and elegant-minded Artist's works, has the stamp of an elegant mind <75>. [*The Wife and Children of a dead Fisherman finding his body on the beach* by Richard Westall]

It has been pointed out that the vocabulary of critics naturally assumed a moral overtone because it had been taken from the language and

concepts of academic theory. The adjective 'chaste' used to characterise colouring for instance, must undoubtedly be linked to the tradition within academic theory of associating colour with the sensual, and line with the intellect. Hogarth, in his Analysis of Beauty published in the mid-eighteenth century <76>, had complained that 'chaste' was an 'affectation' taken from the French, but it was much favoured by late eighteenth and early nineteenth century periodical critics. In his article 'A Clash of Discourses: Venetian Painting in England 1750-1850' <77> J B Bullen has discussed how in academic theory, colour had been personified as a wanton woman citing, along with examples from Reynolds, Blake, Fuseli and Opie, Dryden's introduction to du Fresnoy's The Art of Painting:

> Our author [du Fresnoy] calls colouring, *Lena Sororis*, in plain English the bawd of her sister the Design or Drawing... she cloathes, she dresses her [sister] up, she paints her, she makes her appear more lovely than she naturally is, she procures for the Design, and makes lovers for her <78>.

Academic theory therefore pointed to the dangers of colour, which could, if too seductive, threaten to undermine the intellectual content of painting. 'Chaste' colouring obviously suggested absence of such a threat. Along similar lines, Hunt, as we have already observed, suggested that the visitors to the Royal Academy exhibition go to the sculpture room first, before their eyes were 'debauched by that gay wanton of fancy, - colour' <79> - as a trained artist he was well-versed in the dangerous seductiveness of colour.

While some of the adjectives used by critics can be linked to moral ideas embodied in academic theory which can also be related to social

values, another sub-text of social value is revealed by the choice of adjectives which were often applied to portraits: that of idealised gender. We have already commented on Taylor's fondness for the adjectives 'firm' and 'manly' <80> when describing masculine portraits, and his vocabulary does seem to differentiate between the masculine and the feminine when to applied to portraits, even though the adjectives often concern entirely painterly concepts like say, colouring or drawing. Thus in five randomly sampled years <81> we find the adjective 'firm' used on six occasions with reference to masculine portraits, and not at all with reference to those whose subjects are female. For 'forcible' the same is true. 'Spirited' is used eight times for males and once for a female. 'Dignified' is used nine times in connection with a male subject and twice with relation to a feminine subject. Likewise, 'beautiful' is used seven times for portraits of women and not at all for men. 'Interesting' five times with reference to the former and once in the case of the latter. 'Sweet' is applied to two female portraits and no male ones. (It should also be noted that number of masculine portraits reviewed, far out-weighs female - forty-two to sixteen - again perhaps telling us something about contemporary social values in relation to the sexes).

Hunt similarly seemed to differentiate between the sort of qualities he expected to find in male and female portraits. For instance, on one occasion he commented that the scuptor Behnes had 'a masculine grace in his men and a sweetness in his women' <82> and on another remarked:

> For boldness of attitude, firmness of style, vigour of drawing, and natural fleshy hue, no one surpasses Mr. Phillips. He is therefore the painter of men' <83>.

Again, such social values also intermingled with aesthetic theory. This can be seen, for example, in one of Flaxman's lectures which stated:

> In the formation or appearance of the body, we shall always find that its beauty depends on its health, strength, and agility, most convenient motion and harmony of parts in the male and female human figure, according to the purposes for which they were intended: the man for greater power and exertion, the woman for tenderness and grace <84>.

So, certain sub-texts were manifest in the adjectives used by critics, which tended to affirm established social, cultural and aesthetic values. The evidence discussed above has pointed to two of these in particular - moral behaviour associated with the rules of decorum, and gendered social values - but there may well be others which future research will be able to reveal.

We have discussed the language of reviewers in terms of how, in being inherently problematic as a means of defining certain visual ideas, it perhaps took on a more important role in helping to reinforce established ideologies. In conclusion however, we must point out some of the ways in which this language, in spite of being the medium in which such ideologies were intricately interwoven, was actually able to assist to change them. Especially important in this respect, are the ways in which the vocabulary of art criticism positively contributed to the breakdown of the norms established by academic theory. Perhaps the starting point for this was in the fact that criticism, by arbitrarily applying the same criteria of judgement to all genres, helped to undermine the hierarchy of genres: academic theory had stressed history painting's supremacy and therefore gave rules which were meant to be

applied principally to this superior genre. But, when the rules became critical criteria they were used to judge lower genres as well. We find Hunt for example, although a strong advocate of history painting applying the term 'attitude' to mere cattle, when in the context of traditional academic theory the term implied the postures and actions of human figures: 'The cattle are varied and natural in colour, attitude and drawing' <85>. As this was in all essence a repudiation of one of the most important presuppositions of academic theory, it could not help but to erode it.

It has been noted how the adjective 'chaste' was a favourite term for describing colouring at the end of the eighteenth century, and how this usage was in accordance with notions concerning the intellectual importance of the painter's art. Similarly, it might be pointed out how 'exact', 'correct' and 'accurate' tended to get used for design or drawing. But, as such words entered into the general repertoire of critics they became employed in conjunction with other concepts and eventually became interchangable. It seems that by about the end of the second decade of the nineteenth century, 'chaste' and 'correct' had lost most of their original associations with colour and drawing respectively, hence Hunt could speak of 'correctness' of *colour* and 'chastened' *force* <86>, Carey of 'chastity' of *execution* <87> and both confuse what had been once been a fundamental distinction between the sensual and intellectual.

A topic which is far too complex to cover fully, given the present state of knowledge and difficulty of separating the personal vocabulary of critics from more general trends, is how the introduction of new adjectives into the vocabulary of reviewers, also aided the gradual

breakdown of the aesthetic norms which had been the original inheritance of the language of appreciation. The absence of the adjective 'clever' from Taylor's vocabulary has already been noted <88>, and it has been suggested that its presence in the vocabulary of other critics may be a distinguishing factor between the younger generation and older. In Hunt's reviews it is revealed how such novel words might have insidiously worked their way into the terminology of reviewers, by being first used in a pejorative sense. The adjective 'clever' seems to have been reserved, during most of Hunt's career, entirely to evoke that which fell short of excellence or greatness. At the close of his critique of Harlow's *The Court for the Trial of Queen Katherine* (Pl.49) for instance, he stated:

> Let him [Harlow] carefully see to the above defects, and also to a more equally firm pencilling throughout, to a tinting of objects as good in particulars as it is in the general disposition, and above all, never to let his emulative thirst be satisfied with the luscious thoughts of partial praise, but to be assured, that the mind that can repose complacently on previous and partial attainments, and that can stop its industry at the solicitations of ease, will be considered clever, but not great, - will be classed with the many of mediocrity, but never with the illustrious few <89>.

Or, likewise his initial commentary on the Royal Academy exhibition of 1824 declared:

> There are but two noticible historical pictures, and those are only clever, and do not rise to the importance demanded by dignified art... one is by Mr.Briggs... the other by Mr. Allan [(Pl.50)] <90>.

However, towards the end of his career with The Examiner he took to using the adjective without qualification, as in his brief comment on Good's *Interior with Figures* which he thought 'hard and somewhat heavy... for want of touch, though clever in other respects' <91>, or his reference to Mr. and Mrs. Ross' 'many clever miniatures' <92>. Thus we can see how a term which originally served to define undesirable characteristics could slip into the vocabulary of approbation. The possibility of applying the same terminology to all genres indiscriminately, is again important here, since Hunt who took such a hard line on its importance, even at the end of his career, would have been unlikely to have used 'clever' to describe a history painting. However, it can be seen that once a new word had entered into the critical vocabulary in this way <93> other critics would latch on to it, and use it to serve whatever ends they wanted.

Finally, it has already been noted how the repeated use of the same critical criteria tended to make exhibition reviews somewhat unsatisfactory pieces of prose. There was a natural need for critics to vary their comments: this being perhaps more easily done by introducing new adjectives than by inventing new criteria. Critics perhaps therefore added their own novel adjectives to the stock available, simply in order to try to avoid cliché. But, in their choice, we can see how the traditional principles of academic theory were again threatened. For example, there is evidence to suggest that the adjective 'delicious' increased in popularity during the first couple of decades of the nineteenth century <94>. Its initial use may have been inadvertent, but in conveying an appreciation which overtly declared

itself as fundamentally sensual, it did little to promote the idea that the visual arts appealed to the higher regions of the intellect.

Chapter Six

The Historical Context: A Microcosm

William Jerdan's name has already appeared several times in this study as the editor of the Sun during some of the years when evidence points to John Taylor as having been its regular art critic. In having documented the troublesome affair of the friction between the two men in his memoirs, his writings have proved an invaluable source of information. When he left the Sun in 1817, Jerdan became editor of The Literary Gazette, a weekly publication which enjoyed some success until the 1830s <1>. The four volumes of Jerdan's Autobiography provide much literary gossip and other information concerning his years as editor of The Literary Gazette, including the fact that, among others, the editor himself acted as art critic <2>. We have already seen in the relationship between Taylor and Farington how the press world could intertwine with the artistic one. In Jerdan's case, a significant connection with the latter was his friendship with Lord de Tabley, with whom he boasts intimacy during the course of his reminiscences. To illustrate their friendly terms, he quotes the following letter <3>:

Tabley House, 8th March, 1825

DEAR SIR,

In perfect confidence I trouble you with rather a more weighty concern in the way of art than I *expected*, but I hope it may turn out well.

A short extract from Westmacott's letter will explain it best:-

"South Audley Street, March 3rd.

"SIR JOHN,

"On my return yesterday from Wilton, I found your very flattering letter and acceptance of my labours. Artists are perhaps not the best judges of their own efforts, but I confess I shall feel a little disappointed if my "Nymph and Zephyr" is not as favourably received as even the "Psyche".

"I have, I think, caught your ideas in the management I have adopted, which is well calculated to display the graces and prominent beauties of the female form, whilst the playfulness of the child heightens the interest of the group. I enter fully with your feelings in being desirous to withhold the work from general view for the present, but I see no objection to your wish that Mr. Jerdan should see it and notice it. Mr. Parker has reported me truly in the money part of the commission. I have never thought beyond your gallery, and beg to name the price at 750l."

May I hope, therefore, you will have the goodness to take an opportunity of seeing it, and mentioning it as you think fit, as one of the novelties for my gallery next year; and what I am still more anxious for, is to have your private opinion of it. Pray also remember the fishing season is advancing, and shall be quite disappointed if you let it pass unheeded or unmindful of your friends at Tabley.

Believe me, dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

JOHN F. T. LEICESTER.

It will be remembered that the Tabley House information bat made use of a press cutting from The Literary Gazette (Pl.1), and attention has already been drawn to the bat's important value in providing a contemporary example of one of the ways in which periodical art criticism functioned <4>. It is perhaps more than the historian could hope for, that this very cutting should be dated less than a month after the letter quoted in Jerdan's Autobiography and should concern Westmacott's *Nymph and Zephyr* (Pl.3), thus completing a record of events which creates an historical tableau and enlivens our topic.

It has been stressed in this dissertation that, for the art historian, the journalistic art criticism of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries represents a tricky primary source (particularly in terms of its overwhelming quantity and diversity, and its multi-dimensionality). However, this perception perhaps stems partly from our expectations of it. We see it as 'evidence' and, as such, expect to be able to 'use' it, to throw light on our knowledge of the art and society of the period. Naturally, this approach tends to emphasise the material's problematic nature, for we must make certain that we do not misuse it, or draw from it the wrong conclusions.

If the present study has served one main end it has been to point out that, at this stage, we actually gain more by expecting less. We should not immediately, and impatiently, attempt to transform this mine of information into a grand history - it simply does not lend itself to such an application. It is too complex. Instead, we must allow it to reveal gradually its intricacies by pursuing those tracks which take us not across its surface, but below it. Had it attempted a more ambitious analysis or tried to prove a theory, rather than keep its scope

restrained and its method empirical, would this study have uncovered Jerdan's, de Tabley's and Westmacott's small part in this history? Though a only microcosm of a bigger network of events and relationships, such glimpses of the past fill in details which deepen our understanding of the subject and which may eventually be able to contribute to a broader interpretation.

The Literary Gazette's review of Westmacott's *Nymph and Zephyr* has then, beyond its face value, a history: it was written at the request of the patron of the sculpture and with the consent of the artist, in order to give the work advanced publicity and to publicise the former's collection generally. The author of the review was chosen through personal acquaintance and his role as a critic was perceived as two-fold - public and private. That de Tabley made a distinction between Jerdan's 'private' opinions and those which were to be published, fits in with some of our earlier observations on Taylor, whom it seems strongly separated the two roles <5>. That de Tabley, if he was not simply flattering Jerdan, seemed genuinely desirous of Jerdan's private opinions attests to the value which he assigned to the latter's critical judgements. The latter was the son of a small landowner, had begun his career as a clerk in a merchant's office, and had entered journalism in 1806, aged twenty-four <6>. That he had risen to the social level of enjoying the friendship of a baronet (de Tabley was made a Lord in 1826), says something about the upward social mobility which some journalists were able to achieve, (especially when they commanded editorships) in spite of a certain stigma attached to the profession <7>. That, Jerdan, as far as we know, never received any formal training in art, should also be kept in mind.

The review itself appeared in The Literary Gazette on Saturday 26 March 1825, and in a Friday edition of the periodical (as indicated by the date on the information bat). It was placed alongside a notice of the sale of the library of Professor Langles [the orientalist]; a notice of the annual exhibition of the Society of British Artists, which along with the review of *Nymph and Zephyr* was headed 'Fine Arts'; a poem entitled 'Love's Reproaches' by L. E. L. [Letitia Elizabeth Landon] under the heading 'Original Poetry' and a review of one of a series of concerts of 'ancient music' headed 'Music', which talked of the 'sweet' and 'peculiarly rich and full tones' of Miss Wilkinson's voice. With, of course, the exception of the poetry, some of these articles may also have been the work of Jerdan's hand <8>. Assuming each copy was read by about ten people <9>, and that the Gazette had a circulation of something between 3,000-4,000 <10>, the review was perhaps read by approximately 35,000 people, most probably at home, rather than in a coffee-shop or tea-house <11>.

The content of the review compared the *Nymph and Zephyr* with an earlier sculpture by Westmacott entitled *Psyche*, which had been exhibited at the Royal Academy three years previously, thus assuming (wrongly or rightly) that the reader was already familiar with the work of the artist. It discussed the way in which the main figure was 'draped', the '*ensemble*' of the group (which was italised to indicate its French origin), the way in which the Zephyr was 'disposed', and the 'expression' of both countenances - all concepts which derived from traditional academic theory. A variety of adjectives and qualifying words were attached to these concepts: the figure was 'modestly, but finely' draped; the *ensemble* was 'truly graceful'; 'delicacy' and

'nature' were prominent qualities of the group; the Zephyr was 'sweetly' disposed; the countenances were 'tender and soft'; and the group was altogether 'delightful' ('fine', 'graceful', 'delicate', 'delightful', 'natural', 'sweet' and 'soft' all formed part of John Taylor's core vocabulary <12>. A few specific details were mentioned: that the Nymph was approximately the same size as Westmacott's *Psyche* and resembled its 'form and proportions'; that the Zephyr was shown 'extending his arms and hands' for the butterfly held by the Nymph; and, that he was 'rather playfully entreating, than teazing for the object of his wishes'. The review ended with a puff (in spite of Jerdan's professed objections to puffing, quoted in Chapter Three) for the 'noble patron of the arts' who had commissioned the sculpture in order 'to adorn his splendid gallery of the works of native genius'. It was noted that the addition of the work to de Tabley's collection added 'the efforts of the chisel' to 'those of the easel' (hence de Tabley's pun on 'weighty' and reference to 'novelty' in his letter to Jerdan) and thus raised him 'higher than he even stood before in the esteem and gratitude of every lover of our Fine Arts'. The review therefore demonstrated most of the principal characteristics of typical reviews of the period.

Since we know that its readers would not have seen the work, how might they have responded to the review? First of all it has to be stated that in this case there is no doubt its primary function was publicity rather than art criticism. As such, it is interesting to note how little it says which enables us to begin to visualise the work and how the language of description is intermingled with that of critical evaluation. Nevertheless, while it apparently evaluates the sculpture in terms of such concepts as 'ensemble', 'disposition' and

'expression', the effect of the review is to pile up a succession of loaded words, mainly in their adjectival form, which accumulate so as to work on the reader's imagination. Its seems that they particularly seek to suggest idealised femininity (graceful, delicate, modest and sweet - even though the latter is applied to the Zephyr) and to bring to mind the texture of real human flesh (soft and tender). And so, what is on the surface, a description of a piece of marble sculpture, conveys to the reader, less the appearance of a work of art, but a set of associations, appealing to both intellect and senses, but perhaps primarily to the latter.

The sculpture was presumably properly installed in de Tabley's gallery in 1826, and (as it seems it went straight to Tabley House, rather than being placed first in de Tabley's London gallery <13>) it is unlikely that more than a very small proportion of people got to view it, compared with the 35,000 who had read about it in The Literary Gazette. It was displayed with other contemporary British works of art, some of which themselves had been the subjects of the critical judgements of journalists. They included Lawrence's *Lady Leicester as Hope* (Pl.21) and Turner's *Fall at Schaffhausen* (Pl.13) <14>, which have already been mentioned during the course of this dissertation <15>.

Information bats were devices which de Tabley used in both his London gallery and at Tabley <16>. He was not the only collector to use them (one survivies at Woburn, dated 1795), but usually they were designed to inform visitors of the titles and artists of all the works in the room - often indicating their locations on a plan <17>. The *Nymph and Zephyr* information bat is the only surviving bat which I have located so far which was designed to be used in conjunction with one work only.

Unfortunately such bats are scarce: surprisingly unrobust objects considering their function, many of them must have been damaged and destroyed.

Although there is a slight possiblity that Jerdan sent him the cutting, de Tabley probably prepared the text for the *Nymph and Zephyr* bat himself since there still exists at Tabley House, a scrapbook of miscellaneous cuttings on a wide variety of subjects (including the fine arts, and including articles from The Literary Gazette) which appears to have been his own <18>. It seems therefore, that de Tabley was in the habit of taking press cuttings. As already noted <19>, on the other side of the bat, he chose to inscribe a poem by Letitia Elizabeth Landon which took Westmacott's sculpture as its subject. It was first published in The Literary Gazette <20> (the poetess being a great favourite of Jerdan's <21>) as a series of poems on modern works of art <22>. It subsequently appeared in a collected volume of L.E.L.'s verses <23>. The poem conjures up an atmospheric scene of a fresh, dewy, sunny summer's morning, and describes the Nymph's refusal to give the Zephyr the butterfly. She tells him that when she lets it go, he will instead moralise over the pleasure that from him flies: 'Then it is pleasure, for we possess/ But in the search, not in the success'. The poem mentions, perhaps significantly in view of Westmacott's earlier sculpture, that the butterfly's wing is 'sacred to PSYCHE and to Spring.'

For those visitors who used the information bat, how did it contribute to their experience of viewing the scultpure? Certainly, both the poem and the review would have stimulated the viewer's imagination <24>. The poem especially, takes the viewer into new

dimensions by suggesting colours and movement (the butterfly's 'hues of an Indian stone, the Nymph's light step) and by introducing new ideas altogether (the 'lithe grass stem','lilies' bells', and even a dialogue). The information bat presumably functioned also as a useful device for aiding the conversation of visitors. The review itself probably encouraged critical judgements along similar lines, using the basic principles of academic theory in conjunction with appropriate adjectives. If the visitors knew Westmacott's *Psyche* it would be recalled to mind and comparisons made. The flattering remarks concerning de Tabley, (and maybe his main reason for using the cutting), would remind them (if indeed they needed it) of his national importance as a patron and collector of British art, and promote patriotic thoughts and comments.

Whilst the *Nymph and Zephyr* was being admired by visitors to de Tabley's collection, it received a commentary in Carey's Memoirs of Lord de Tabley, published in 1826 <25>. The commentary uses much the same sort of language as that employed by periodical art critics (Carey after all *was* one of them <26>), but it is given somewhat more space than the average newspaper critique and standard academic criteria are applied more sparingly, suggesting a growing shift away from this sort of criticism. In comparison with Jerdan's review, a greater attempt is made to convey details of the actual appearance of the sculpture: we are told that the Nymph is 'bearing on her left foot', that 'her left side is advanced', that 'her head is inclined forward' and so on. The commentary also dwells quite considerably on what reads as a rather sensual (almost sexual) interpretation of the sculpture: the Nymph 'with a playful contrariety... seems to offer, and at the same time, archly to

withhold the object of allurement. The tender pressure of her arm and hand across his [the Zephyr's] back, at once, conveys the idea of caressing, and of restraining the little urchin...The breast of the winged truant is pressed close to hers; and his limbs are in motion, as if half fluttering and half climbing up her beautiful person, to snatch at the temptation with which she invites and mocks his eager pursuit'. The adjective 'delicious' is applied to the whole group - a word which, as has been observed, seems not to have been part of the standard vocabulary of older generation critics <27>.

In June 1827 de Tabley died and many works were sold off to meet other financial needs <28>. The group of the *Nymph and Zephyr* was bought by de Tabley's near neighbour Earl Grosvenor, and is still in the collection of the Duke of Westminster, at Eaton Hall today. At the Royal Academy exhibition of 1828, the sculpture went on show to the general public for the first time and exposed to the critical judgements of those journalist reviewers who went to the exhibition. Robert Hunt for one, in the final instalment of what was to be his last Royal Academy review for The Examiner, noticed it briefly. He found that the mind wandered with delight over its 'airy and angel forms' and he complimented its figures, which along with those in Campbell's *Cupid and Psyche*, he considered to be 'of antique proportion and execution' <29>. An anonymous and unidentified reviewer in The New Monthly Magazine, however, found little to say about the group and nothing to praise, for in his opinion it was 'not equal' to Westmacott's 'other productions of the same nature' <30>. Of the two points of view, those of The New Monthly Magazine's reviewer were more influential: his remarks were read

by about twice as many people <31> since by this stage The Examiner was past its heyday and in decline.

Such is the little story of Westmacott's *Nymph and Zephyr* and the part that some pieces of journalist art criticism played in the various responses to it. Though it concerns just one work of art, it is quite a complicated story, but as such, it serves to demonstrate some of the intricacies that we ought to try to unravel before we can place journalist art criticism into a rounded picture of the past. Even so, the story itself is far from complete. We still know virtually nothing about the average reader of periodicals. How much notice did he or she take of this type of art criticism and in what ways did he or she understand or interpret it? We *do* know that artists, and those with a vested interest took notice of the comments of reviewers: we have already mentioned that Turner copied Taylor's review of *Mercury and Hersé* into a sketching book and other records of this nature exist - Farington copied into his diary, reviews of the pictures which he exhibited at the Royal Academy exhibition in 1795 which were given in the Ledger and London Packet, the Sun (and True Briton), and the St. James' Chronicle <32>; Constable's correspondence reveals that the artist and his family and friends took notice of reviews as a barometer of his success, or lack of it <33>; W. L. Pressly has suggested that an etching after Barry's *Jupitor and Juno* was altered in response to a criticism of the painting in the Morning Chronicle in 1773 <34>; And, by his own account, Lawrence held an ambivalent attitude towards newspaper criticism and critics. In 1794 he had written to an unknown correspondent pointing out their value <35>: 'Something may be learnt [from them], and the greatest improvement I remember to have made in my

works was from seeing a critique upon them that when I learnt to distinguish flesh from glass I might make a tolerable painter' <36>. Some years later he wrote to Farington, suggesting that critics' opinions could be bought for the price of a dinner: 'my dear Friend, - I am vexed to find myself not so indifferent to Newspaper Criticism as I was. Mr. Perry (editor of the Morning Chronicle), sagacious gentleman, has found out that my Picture [*Sir Francis Baring and Friends* (Pl.17)] is flaring and gaudy and of course makes me second to H[oppne]r. He [Hoppner] has them. A dinner or two serves them' <37>.

Although we know more about artists' responses to reviews than those of the ordinary reader, we do have evidence that the power of the press was perceived to be great and a matter of grave importance. In 1811 Josiah Conder published a pamphlet which deplored the current quality of literature criticism. 'Certainly the spirit of Criticism is of a superficial nature, and the Fashion of the times is most unfavourable to habits of deep thought and candid enquiry' he lamented <38>. His pamphlet pointed out how bad criticism could destroy a good work of literature:

> 'It is impossible to read in a Review, in which the sublimest or most pathetic passages have been burlesqued or dissected, without having our future relish of them impaired; for even if our opinion remain unaffected, the disgusting recollection of the Criticism itself will not infrequently divert our attention, and alloy the pleasure which those passages originally excited <39>.

William Stevenson writing in Blackwoods Magazine in 1824, was concerned that periodicals should promote sound reasoning and taste:

> 'When we consider the influence of a Magazine of extensive

> circulation, it surely must be of great consequence that its pages should tend to elevate the intellect of its readers; that they should rise from its perusal, not merely delighted and gratified by a display of fine or eloquent writing, but having their taste purified, their judgment rendered stronger, and their habits of observation and reflection quickened and confirmed...It is necessary to guard the public against erroneous principles of reasoning and taste, when they are brought forward under the authority of any of the three principal Quarterly Reviews; - an authority which is so general and strong, that it becomes necessary carefully and scrupulously to watch and examine all that it endeavours to teach and enforce <40>.

In 1832 a writer in The Athenaeum commented: 'The press has a vast power at present in the land...it thinks and speaks and criticises for the multitude' and in the following year Library of the Fine Arts suggested that 'The critical voice' had 'a value attached to it' which was 'co-important with art itself' <41>. We have already noted that Robert Hunt considered the interest of the press in the fine arts to have been an important force in shaping their development <42>. James Mill, writing in The Westminster Review on the other hand, was worried that the press had a tendency, not to set standards of taste, but to simply follow public opinion. A periodical, unlike a book, relied on immediate success, hence it was 'almost certain to profess and inculcate the opinions already held by the public to which it addresses itself, instead of attempting to rectify or improve their opinions' <43>.

That contemporaries assigned to the press such a central role in the development of taste validates the historical significance of journalist

art criticism and the importance of its study. There is no doubt that the period which forms the subject of this dissertation was one of immense instability as far as critical values and matters of taste were concerned. A writer in The Edinburgh Review in 1813 even commented on how the age was one in which 'the rules of judging and the habits of feeling' were 'unsettled' <44>. This can be attributed not only to the unsettling social changes which accompanied industrialisation and to developments in the arts themselves, but also to the role of the press as disseminator of taste. We have argued that we should guard against associating literary genre with intellectual quality <45>. Nevertheless, it *is* of historical importance that the periodical press, a notably ephemeral form of literature, did enjoy such popularity during the first few decades of the nineteenth century. And, so too is it fair to state that, although they reveal some important sub-texts, the type of critical criteria and the vocabulary which were the common fare of exhibition reviews of the period, (as well as the sheer number of works on which they attempted to comment), did have the effect of discouraging the sort of critical commentary which gave considered and in-depth analysis. As exhibition reviews formed a substantial part of the art criticism which was published in the press they cannot have failed to have moulded the critical values of the day. Perhaps equally important, is the fact that the multifarious nature of the periodical press failed to provide a focal point: quality was mixed with dross, in a way which made it difficult to sort out the former from the latter - particularly when it all appeared to spring from the same fountain of anonymity.

In 1843 George Darley, one of the art critics of The Athenaeum, expressed some revealing sentiments concerning the state of 'aesthetics'

during the two reigns before Victoria. Ostensibly an obituary of William Seguier, Keeper of the National Gallery and the Royal Collection, the article is a plea for higher standards of knowledge, taste and art criticism. Darley was a learned writer, as Claude Colleer Abbott's study of him has shown, and although the periodical press was his medium, his journalism was 'no mere question of mutton-chops' <46>. 'Few of his contemporaries had his qualifications' and 'had he attacked the subject in a more reasoned manner, at his leisure, his name as a critic would doubtless have been well known' <47>. The comments he makes in the obituary are a fascinating mixture of values and feelings. They look at the past decades within terms which suggest a wistful yearning for the social order of the eighteenth century <48>. His ideal 'connoisseur' was envisaged as an educated 'gentleman' who possessed 'intellectual endowments' and 'purified', 'exalted' and 'expanded tastes'. Darley even uses Richardson's term 'connoissance' and deplores, as Reynolds had done, those types who descant superficially upon 'the grace of Raffael' and 'the airs of Guido' <49>. At the same time the passage points to the future. A 'deeper vein of criticism' was in demand - and, although he does not state it as such, it seems that the need for society to have a mentor on matters of taste was at the back of his mind.

William Seguier

> We record the death of this well known public officer... less on its own account, though it deserves mention, than because it allows us to express certain opinions... that we have long held, from profound conviction of their truth, but also withheld from delicacy towards an aimable and most repectable man. Our acquaintance with Mr.

Seguier was in matters of *connoisance* alone... He once informed us... of his having been 'taught' by...William Blake... But if he did not imbibe any of that fanciful painter's sublime and singular genius, Nature had bestowed upon him a far more profitable gift - common sense - which he best evinced, perhaps by resigning an art that promised him neither fame nor fortune, and undertaking a lowlier one, that ensured the latter. Instead of an artist, he became a pictorial artizan, called a picture-cleaner... Extended and observant practice... matured his judgment, and made him, before long, a wary connoisseur - a leading critic - and, at length, an oracle. To his succesful career, no doubt, conduced his extreme urbanity, good humour, kindliness, and communicativeness upon the subject of art. Although an uneducated man (we might use a stronger adjective), and speaking, as some persons not illiterate do, the vernacular *patois*, with all its characteristic redundancy and deficiency and vicarious interchange of letters, Mr. Seguier frequented the highest circles, where his natural good breeding received a polish that, despite the said drawbacks, carried him well through conversations not over-refined. We particularize these little items, because they afford an irrefragable test of the state in which artistic criticism stood under the last two reigns: how any one who possessed no intellectual endowments or acquirements - no very purified, or exalted, or expanded tastes - who had no pretentions beyond those of a skilful picture-mender, should have obtained the sovereign chair of connoisseurship, above all his coevals can be accounted for only by the despicable nature of the 'aesthetics' then prevalent... *Seguier*, from a picture cleaner,

superintendent of all the royal and national picture collections together! We do hope, that if these numerous pinacothecas must have... but one overseer, this lay-pluralist will be sought in a more elevated class of *sevans* than picture-cleaners;- let him be a gentleman, either artist or amateur, not unacquainted with ancient and middle-age amd modern literature, famliar with the whole department of Criticism, theoretical as well as practical, possessing enlightened taste, and a comprehensive esteem for *all* the Arts, and all the Schools, and all the Masters, in their distinct yet connected and convergent lines... The very low standard, likewise, taken hitherto by our countrymen makes them, we suspect, imagine the qualities above-mentioned not so much incompatible as superfluous. The late Director's knowledge of art suited their ignorance; it was chiefly, or altogether, anecdotal and traditional; he could cite a pleasant tale about Claude when a pastry cook... he could descant upon the grace of Raffael, and the airs of Guido, etc. etc.; but a deeper vein of criticism is, we trust, now in demand... Upon the whole, as a connoisseur, if he was not in advance of his own era, he was fully abreast of it, and let this merit enjoy due praise, when so many a presumptuous man lags behind the present age while he thinks to lead it. <50>

As we know, in the same year, a graduate from Oxford published the first volume of Modern Painters. The young writer, like Darley, wanted to raise standards: the volume was expressly written, as Ruskin later wrote to Samuel Prout, for 'the class of people who admire[d] Maclise' and for 'the paid novices of the Times and of Blackwoods' <51>. Darley, equipped with maturity and a sounder knowledge, found the work lacking

in learning and undoubtedly would have classed its author among 'the presumptuous' (52), but the second volume of Modern Painters, published in 1846, while it was sorely criticised on many grounds by Darley (who was by then an old and dying man), provoked him and aroused his admiration: 'And still - and still - notwithstanding what we have said, and left unsaid, about the faults and follies committed in almost every page, almost every paragraph - the book deserves perusal, deserves praise (53). Only eleven years later, a writer in Fraser's Magazine declared 'Mr. Ruskin is an English Institution like the House of Lords or the National Gallery' (54). Ruskin's authority was such that, not only might he have been considered worthy of looking after the National Gallery, he was seen as essential to English society as the institution itself! The journalists continued to write, but the profession of art critic had been redefined: the two roles were no longer inextricably combined.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has focussed on a period when contemporary British art was evaluated almost entirely by anonymous writers in the medium of the periodical press. It has sought to investigate these writings and has pointed to the difficulty of devising an wholly satisfactory methodology with which to do this. It has argued that uncovering the identities of critics can be of immense value in helping us to appreciate the historical context of this type of art criticism and in avoiding a one-dimensional analysis. Information which assists the identification of

critics was therefore given in Appendix III, and Chapter Two explored aspects of their lives, such as their other occupational activities and their social backgrounds. The case studies examined some of those local factors which determined the content of reviews: their authors (as shaped by the ideological and cultural forces around them, as well as the idiosyncracies of their individual personalities), and the nature of the publications in which the reviews appeared (political stance, format, editorial control, and so on). For instance, with regard to the former, it was shown that for Taylor, the role of public critic had a distinct meaning, and that this meaning affected the nature of his writings. With regard to the latter, it was seen how, for example, the political leanings of each paper were articulated in critiques of portraits.

The critical idiom inherited by critics was also examined, and it was seen how established social and cultural values could be affirmed or undermined by the comments couched in this idiom. It was suggested that the language and vocabulary of reviewers was a peculiarly potent expressive form, for it disguised ideological content, and therefore had a part to play in both arresting and helping to change it.

The present chapter has looked at the responses of Jerdan and others to Westmacott's *Nymph and Zephyr* and has attempted to put them into a more rounded picture of the past. It has also considered evidence which shows that contemporaries felt the press to have been a powerful force in shaping the taste and values of the population.

As a conclusion to this exploration of journalist art critics and their writings in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, let us return to the problem of methodology and look to the future. The

relevance of Hemingway's recent book to this dissertation has already been noted <55> and the disadvantages of his methodology have been touched on.

His entire thesis puts much stress on the importance to historical analysis of the investigation of the evolution of ideologies: as he states: 'the theory which underpins my inquiry allows considerable autonomy to ideologies and the institutions which sustain them' <56>. This is undoubtedly a valid historical approach with which the present study is sympathetic, and which has enabled Hemingway to investigate some important links between the political inclinations of certain periodicals and the opinions expressed in their fine art columns. However, it is suggested here that in adopting such a premise Hemingway has underrated the importance of uncovering the identities of critics: 'more important than their actual identity as individuals was the voice such critics assumed and the reader they implicitly addressed' <57>.

This is a statement which perhaps does not help to promote further investigation of some of the problems raised by the present study. The consequences of ignoring the identities of critics, would be to limit very seriously our understanding of periodical art criticism. It cannot but be of significance, historically, to know that William Carey, for example, wrote for periodicals of differing political persuasions <58> - a point particularly pertinent to, but not really considered in Hemingway's investigation. It must be of value to see how patrons and artists influenced critics. It would undoubtedly help our understanding of this subject if we could study the vocabulary of individual critics in order to unravel changing critical values. We ought to examine how critics worked within a hierarchical power structure of proprietor,

editor, and contributor and how it affected their writings. These are just a few of the problems raised by this study and which without knowing more about the identities of critics would be impossible to investigate further. As scholars are becoming increasingly interested in the art criticism published in the early nineteenth-century periodical press, let us hope that future research will continue to pursue these issues.

Notes to all Chapters

Notes to pages 1-3

'E.C.' denotes Exhibition Catalogue
Throughout this dissertation the following convention has been observed:
The Sun (definite article not underlined) used for daily or thrice-weekly newspapers
The Examiner (definite article included as name of periodical) used for all other types of periodical

Introduction

1> Claude Colleer Abbott, The Life and Letters of George Darley, (1928), Oxford, 1967, p158.

2> 'Periodical art criticism' is perhaps the best term for describing this discourse, being the most neutral and least ambigous, though in this context 'periodical' must be understood to include not only magazines and journals, but also daily newspapers. Clearly embracing daily newspapers, 'journalist art criticism' presents a good alternative, but its disadvantage is that it is not free from certain evaluative connotations and might even be perceived to have derogatory implications (see pp18-19 below). It also might seem to imply a non-specialist authorship and readership, and so there is a case for arguing that it would be an inappropriate description for, say, an exhibition review written by a trained artist and published in a small circulating specialist art magazine. However, in spite of these associations, I feel that the term is a valid one since the Concise Oxford Dictionary defines 'journal' as 'Daily of other newspaper; other periodical, especially one dealing with current events or learned topics' and defines 'journalist' as 'One whose business it is to edit, or write for a journal, especially a newspaper', (i.e. it does not exlude the notion that a contributor to a 'learned' journal might be termed a journalist). Therefore, throughout this dissertation, in order to avoid repetition, both 'journalist art criticism' and 'periodical art criticism' are used synonymously and the reader should not attach any significance to the choice made.

It might be noted here that Judy Crosby Ivy has put forward another term: 'popular art criticism' (see p3 below), but I find this rather unsatisfactory, for not only is it rather vague, it too evokes qualitative concepts which may not be entirely appropriate. Like 'journalist art criticism', though perhaps even more so, it suggests non-specialism, but in addition, it seems to imply a mass readership, which bearing in mind the levels of illiteracy and the still relatively small circulations of newspapers a the beginning of the nineteenth century (see below p123), is quite misleading.

3> Judy Crosby Ivy, Constable and the Critics, (Suffolk Records Society), Woodbridge, 1991.

Notes to pages 3-9

4> Andrew Hemingway, Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteenth Century Britain, Cambridge, 1992.

5> Ivy, op.cit., p55.

6> Hemingway, op.cit., p11.

7> Philip Vainker, 'Art Criticism and Art Reviewing 1780-1830', unpublished M.A. thesis, Courtauld Institute, 1977, p52.

8> Giles Waterfield (ed.), Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain 1790-1990 (E.C.), London, 1991, p76.

9> I thank Peter Cannon-Brookes, Consultant Curator of the Tabley House Collection, for identifying the handwriting.

Chapter One

1> Jeremy Black, The English Press in the Eighteenth Century, London, 1987, Chapter 1.

2> W. R. M. Lamb, The Royal Academy, London, 1935, p7.

3> George Cumberland, included in the inventory of critics given in Appendix III, for instance, was one such critic.

4> Philip Vainker, 'Art Criticism and Art Reviewing 1780-1830', unpublished M.A. thesis, Courtauld Institute, 1977, p2.
Kate Flint, 'The English Critical Reaction to Contemporary Painting 1878-1910', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1983, p33.

5> Hélène Zmijewska, 'La Critique des Salons en France avant Diderot', Gazette des Beaux Arts, 6th series, vol.76, July-August, 1970.
Tom Crow, Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth Century Paris, New Haven and London, 1985.
Neil McWilliam (ed.), A Bibliography of Salon Criticism in Paris from the *Ancien Régime* to the Restoration 1699-1827, Cambridge, 1991.

6> 'A Friend to the Arts, though no Connoisseur', Middlesex Journal, 23-26 April, 1772.
'A Dilettante', Public Advertiser, 28 April, 1774.
'A Virtuoso', Public Advertiser, 4 May, 1774.

7> Iain Pears, The Discovery of Painting: The Growth of Interest in the Arts in England 1680-1768, New Haven and London, 1988, p201.

8> Richard D. Altick, The English Common Reader: a Social History of the Mass Reading Public, Chicago, 1954, Chapter 4.
Alvar Ellegard, The Readership of the Periodical Press in Mid-Victorian Britain, Göteborg, 1957.
A. P. Wadsworth, Newspaper Circulations 1800-1954, Manchester, 1955.

Notes to pages 9-10

Carlo M. Cipolla, Literacy and Development in the West, London, 1969.
Louis James, Print and the People, London, 1976.

9> In the first decade of the nineteenth century an average of forty newspapers and periodicals were started each year. By 1832 this figure had reached 250. See George Boyce, James Curran and Pauline Wingate (eds.), Newspaper History from the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day, London, 1978, p99.

10> The Sun and The Examiner which are discussed in detail in Chapter Three demonstrate variety in terms of frequency of publication, size, and political stance.

11> Magazines which took on a literary air (e.g. The London Magazine, The Literary Gazette, and The Athenaeum) stressed their role as entertainment, rather than as a forum for political discussion by including features like amusing and 'chatty' articles and plenty of space for original poetry. A more light-hearted feel could permeate into Fine Arts articles: T. G. Wainewright's contributions to The London Magazine were comical and somewhat reminiscent of Sterne (see Chapter Five, note 2).

12> Ackermann's Repository and La Belle Assemblée were designed to appeal to fashionable society, featuring such novelties as hand-coloured plates of the latest styles in dress and actual samples of fabrics.

13> Obvious examples would be Gentleman's Magazine and The Lady's Magazine.

14> The Literary Gazette, 28 June 1817, pp358-9.

15> The Sun, 30 April, 1805.

16> The Examiner, 29 May, 1808.

17> For example, it is noted on p30 above how the Times was erratic in its reviewing of the Royal Academy until 1823.

18> Chapters Three and Four explore some of the effects of format and political context.

19> 'Monthly Retrospect of the Fine Arts', The Monthly Magazine, vol.24, August 1807, p65.

20> e.g. 'Remarks on the Past and Present State of the Fine Arts in England', The Reflector, I, October 1810-March 1811, p207.

21> 'Canova's Latest Work', The Literary Gazette, 1 June, 1822, p346.

22> 'On the Proposed Monument for Lord Melville', Blackwoods Magazine, vol.6, February 1820, p562.

Notes to pages 10-16

23> 'The Travels and Opinions of Edgeworth Benson', The London Magazine, vol.3, January-June, 1821, p9.

24> 'London Exhibitions: New Views at the Diorama', New Monthly Magazine, July 1827, p293.

25> Vainker, op.cit., p2 and p50.

26> Helene E. Roberts, 'Art Reviewing in the Early Nineteenth Century Art periodicals', Victorian Periodicals Newsletter, no.19, March, 1973, p9.

27> i.e. Elisabeth Schneider, The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt, Pennsylvania, 1933.

28> i.e. Judith L. Fisher, 'The Aesthetics of the Mediocre: Thackeray and the Visual Arts', Victorian Studies, vol.26, no.1, 1982.

29> P. P. Howe (ed.), The Complete Works of William Hazlitt, London, 1933, vol.18, p421.

30> W. E. Houghton (ed.), The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900, Toronto, 1966-1989, vols.2 and 4.

31> Christopher Kent, 'Periodical Critics of Drama, Music and Art, 1830-1914', Victorian Periodicals Review, vol.13, nos.1 and 2, 1980.

32> Gordon N. Ray (ed.), Thackeray's Contributions to the Morning Chronicle, Illinois, 1955.

33> Donald Drew Egbert, Social Radicalism and the Arts, London, 1970, p390, briefly mentions him, although a more general history of aesthetics such as Monroe C. Beardsley's Aesthetics from Classical Greece to the Present, Alabama, 1966, while giving some space to Hazlitt (p255) does not give consideration to other periodical art critics.

34> See below pp86-87.

35> Peter D. Funnell, 'Richard Payne Knight: Aspects of Aesthetics and Art Criticism in Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century England', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1985, Introduction.

36> Kenneth Kendall, Leigh Hunt's Reflector, The Hague, 1971, p147.

37> James A. Houck, William Hazlitt: A Reference Guide, Boston, 1977, pp63-68.

38> See below p78

39> P. P. Howe, The Complete Works of William Hazlitt, London, 1930-34.

40> See pp22-23 below.

41> Howe, op.cit, vol.18 (1933) - some of this volume is also taken up with Hazlitt's dramatic criticism.

42> It might be noted that even an alphabetical index of the artists and works of art mentioned in his Royal Academy reviews which was compiled as an aid to researching this dissertation, proved too big to include as an Appendix, comprising over 70 pages.

43> Thackeray's writings on the visual arts have also been included in collected volumes of his works, for instance: Essays, Reviews, Etc. Etc. By William Makepeace Thackeray, (New Century Library Edition), London, 1905.

44> Claude Colleer Abbott, The Life and Letters of George Darley, (1928), Oxford, 1967, p158.

45> Norman Bryson, 'Hazlitt on Painting', Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, vol.37, no.1, 1978, p37.

46> John Barrell, The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt, New Haven and London, 1986, p70ff.

47> Leonello Venturi, The History of Art Criticism, New York, 1964, p238.

48> J. D. O'Hara, 'Hazlitt and the Romantic Criticism of the Fine Arts', Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, vol.27, Autumn, 1968, p87, note 7.

49> For a brief outline of the history of Victorian Periodicals Newsletter later to become Victorian Periodicals Review see N. Merrill Distad, 'The Origins and History of Victorian Periodicals Review, 1954-1984', VPR, vol.18, no.3, 1983, p86.

50> Frank P. Riga and Claude A. Prance, Index to the London Magazine, New York and London, 1978.

51> Martin Butlin and Evelyn Joll, The Paintings of J M W Turner, New Haven and London, 1984, pp60-61.

52> The edition of The Examiner published by University Microfilms International includes the review on 4 June 1809.

53> It omits a review of *Landscape: Breaking up of a Shower* published in the Sun on 6 May 1818 in spite of claiming that this newspaper received a full search.

54> An index of French exhibition reviews has been published recently (see Neil McWilliam, op.cit.), but it does not claim to be comprehensive.

Notes to pages 21-25

55> A file of reviews is being complied by Clare Lloyd-Jacob at the Paul Mellon Centre, London, and currently runs from 1760 to the 1790s. However, the collection, which concentrates on dailies and is based mainly on the holdings of the British Library, is not comprehensive.

56> The one exception to this is Ivy's Constable and the Critics, which comes very close to gathering together the entire critical response to one particular artist. See pp24-25 for further discussion of this book.

57> For example: H. A. D. Miles and David Blayney Brown, Sir David Wilkie of Scotland (E.C.), (North Carolina Museum of Art), Raleigh, 1986; David Blayney Brown, Augustus Wall Callcott (E.C.), (Tate Gallery), London, 1981; Michael Rosenthal, Constable, London, 1987.

58> Jed Perl, 'The New Republic', 5 May 1986, quoted in Helene E. Roberts, 'Periodicals and Art History' in Don J. Vann and Rosemary T. VanArsdel (eds.), Victorian Periodicals: A Guide to Research, New York, 1989, vol.2.

59> It cites from approxmately forty different periodicals.

60> Bultin and Joll, op.cit., p105.

61> Ibid. p227.

62> Ivy, op.cit.

63> Without underminding Ivy's achievement, in order to illustrate the problematic nature of this primary source, it should be emphasised that even her catalogue fails to be fully comprehensive. After ten years of gathering data, Ivy decided she had to stop, and in her introduction admits that the collection is not 'definitive', acknowledging the existence of other 'numerous and tantalizing' London journals which she 'never quite got around to' and the provincial and foreign periodicals from which quotes only because the critiques have been 'unearthed by previous scholars' (pxiv). In Appendix B she also acknowledges that although she attempted to search complete runs of forty of the periodicals from which she quotes, 'library holdings were frequently imperfect'. It is important to stress this, since in aiming only to collect criticisms of Constable, her task was apparently circumscribed, and yet by her own admission loose ends remained loose owing to the magnitude of this task.

64> Butlin and Joll, op.cit., pxviii.

65> Ibid. pp52-53.

66> The Sun, 27 May 1807.

67> Butlin and Joll, op.cit., p54.

68> It would be an injustice to Butlin and Joll to point out only the shortcomings of their book, for in spite of its arbitrariness, it is second only to Ivy's catalogue in being one of the most thorough collections of this nature, and represents an invaluable source for anyone interested in the critical response to Turner's career.

69> Vainker, op.cit..

70> Helene E. Roberts, 'British Art Periodicals of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries', Victorian Periodicals Review, no.9, 1970.

71> Trevor Fawcett and Clive Phillpot, The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines, London, 1976.

72> Roberts, op.cit., (1973).

73> Helene E. Roberts, 'Trains of Fascinating and of Endless Imagery: Associationist Art Criticism Before 1850', Victorian Periodicals Review, vol.10, no.3, 1977.

74> Helene E. Roberts, 'Exhibition and Review: the Periodical Press and the Victorian art Exhibition System' in Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (eds.), The Victorian Press, Leicester and Toronto, 1984, Chapter 4.

75> Roberts, op.cit., (1989).

76> Abbott, op.cit.
Robyn Cooper, 'The Growth of Interest in Early Italian Painting: George Darley and The Athenaeum, 1834-1846', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol.43, 1980, p201.

77> Anne Bermingham, 'Reading Constable', Art History, vol.10, no.1, March 1987.

78> Sam Smiles, '"Splashers", "Scrawlers", and "Plasterers": British Landscape Painting and the Language of Criticism', Turner Studies, vol.10, no.1, Summer 1990, pp5-11.

79> Andrew Hemingway, 'Academic theory versus Association Aesthetics: The Ideological Forms of a Conflict of Interests in the Early Nineteenth Century', Ideas and Production, no.5, 1986.

80> Andrew Hemingway, Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteenth Century Britain, Cambridge, 1992, Chapter 7.

81> Flint, op.cit..

82> These years were 1812 and 1815.

83> This is, for example, what Helene E. Roberts does tacitly, in her article 'Art Reviewing in the Early Nineteenth Century Art Periodicals', which judging from the selection of journals quoted, appears to have been based on six art periodicals - a small proportion of the 57 art periodicals which she had named in her checklist published three years earlier.

84> See below pp123-124.

85> See below p123.

86> Andrew Hemingway, 'The Political Theory of Painting, without the Politics', Art History, vol.10, September, 1987.

87> Nor does his book offer an entirely satisfactory solution. See below p263.

88> John Barrell, The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt, New Haven and London, 1986, p316.

89> As he states: 'Because of the huge volume of press and periodical criticism produced in the early nineteenth century, the survey on which the following account is based was necessarily a limited and selective one.' Hemingway, op.cit. (1992), p108.

90> See below pp263-265.

91> As Ivy so accurately observes with regard to her collection of Constable criticisms: 'The greatest obstacle to any consideration of Constable criticism... is its fundamental diversity. It can accommodate almost any reading of his reputation and be manipulated to substantiate a strikingly wide range of conclusions.' Ivy, op.cit., p6.

Chapter Two

1> William Jerdan, Autobiography of William Jerdan, London, 1852-3, vol.2, p176.

2> Ibid. p188 and p234.

3> Alexander Andrews, A History of British Journalism, London, 1859, vol.II, p32.

4> See below p65.

5> See below p135-136.

6> John Britton, The Fine Arts of the English School, London, 1812, Preface.

7> Henry Moses, The Gallery of Pictures Painted by Benjamin West, London, 1810.

8> Frank P. Riga and Claude A. Prance, Index to The London Magazine, New York and London, 1978, and P. P. Howe, Complete Works of William Hazlitt, London, 1930-34.

9> T. Roland Hughes, 'The London Magazine 1820 to 1829', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1931, Part 2.

10> Josephine Bauer, The London Magazine 1820 to 1829, Copenhagen, 1953, Chapter 11.

11> Elmer Leroy Brooks, 'Studies in the London Magazine', unpublished doctoral thesis, Harvard, 1954, Chapter 6.

12> Riga and Prance, op.cit.

13> Riga and Prance, Bauer, and Hughes all agree on this.

14> 'Notices of the Arts', The London Magazine, January 1820, pp70-71, (Unsigned).

15> Ibid. p70.

16> In 1815, for instance, he had written articles in The Champion supporting Haydon's judgement over the Elgin Marbles.

17> 'British Institution', The London Magazine, March 1820, pp309-310 and April 1820, pp448-449.

18> The London Magazine, January 1820, p71.

19> The London Magazine, February 1820, p174.

20> The London Magazine, March 1820, p310.

21> 'On the Elgin Marbles' in P. P. Howe, Complete Works of William Hazlitt, vol.18, p155.

22> 'Conversations of Northcote', P. P. Howe, op.cit., vol.11, p251.

23> 'On the Elgin Marbles', P. P. Howe, op.cit., vol.18, p155.

24> William Paulet Carey, Memoirs of Lord de Tabley , London, 1826, pp52-53.

25> Trevor Fawcett and Clive Phillpot (eds.), The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines, London, 1976.

26> Christopher Kent, 'Periodical Critics of Drama, Music and Art, 1830-1914', Victorian Periodicals Review, vol.18, nos.1&2, 1980, p33

27> William Carew Hazlitt (ed.), Criticisms on Art by William Hazlitt, London, 1844.

28> Published simultaneously in The Examiner and The Champion on 17 March 1816.

29> It would be wrong not to point out that Ruskin had of course received some training in art and possessed considerable skills as a draughtsman. However, in the context of the court case with Whistler he represented the right of any individual to set himself up as an authority on art and act as a mediator between artists and the public with the power to potentially ruin an artist's career.

30> Stanley Weintraub, Whistler: A Biography, London, 1974, p203.

31> Tom Taylor (ed.), The Autobiography and Memoirs of Banjamin Robert Haydon, London, 1926, vol.2, p516.

32> Although on another occasion he condemned 'the technical nonsense of de Piles'. See below p198.

33> See Dagley's entry in Appendix III.

34> William Paulet Carey, A Descriptive Catalogue of a Collection of Paintings by British Artists in the possession of Sir John Fleming Leicester, London, 1819, p35.

35> Taking into account not only the annual exhibitions of the Royal Academy, but those of the other major exhibiting institutions, there was a long period between August and the end of January when no important public exhibition was held.

36> 'I will make a few remarks upon some of the most conspicuous performances' [Review of the Royal Academy Exhibition], signed X.W., The Public Advertiser, 1 May 1767.
'I shall now give you my opinions of the performances in the Great Room' [Review of the R.A. Exhibition], signed 'Candid' [George Cumberland], the Morning Chronicle, 5 May 1781.
'To judge of this performance with propriety, is only less difficult than it was to paint it' [Review of Reynolds' *Hercules*, at the R.A. Exhibition], unsigned, Analytical Review, June 1788, vol.1, p218.
'Considerable attention has been excited by this performance' [Review of *The Angry Father* by Opie at the R.A. Exhibition], unsigned, [probably John Taylor], the Sun, 10 May 1802.

'The exhibition contains many pleasing and some vigorous performances' [Review of the Exhibition of the Associated Artists in Water Colours], signed R.H. [Robert Hunt], The Examiner, 30 April 1809, p287.
'We now proceed to consider some few of the performances in detail', [Review of the R.A. Exhibition], unsigned, The New Monthly Magazine, 1 June 1817, p448.

37> James Elmes, A General and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Fine Arts, London, 1826.
The subject of *ut pictura poesis* has received consideration from, among others: John Barrell, The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt, New Haven and London, 1986; Lawrence Lipking, The Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth Century England, Princeton, 1970; R. W. Lee, Ut Pictura Poesis, New York, 1967; Moshe Barasch, Theories of Art from Plato to Winkelmann, New York, 1985.

38> Sam Smiles, '"Splashers", "Scrawlers", and "Plasterers": British Landscape Painting and the Language of Criticism', Turner Studies, vol.10, no.1, Summer 1990.

39> The Morning Chronicle, 16 May 1781.

40> The Morning Chronicle, 7 January 1782.

41> The Examiner, 15 January 1809, pp43-45.

42> G. E. Lessing, Laocoon, (1799). The first English translation was published in 1836, but its ideas were introduced to this country during the period 1803-1823 by Fuseli in his Royal Academy Lectures.

43> For instance, in Annals of the Fine Arts (1816, vol.1, p162) we find Haydon upholding its ideas: 'Poetry and Painting require the same minds, the means only are different, language and versification are the means of the one, and form, colour, and light and shadow the means of the other'.

44> e.g. The Literary Gazette regularly devoted a page or a couple of pages to new poetry.

45> Ian Jack, Keats and the Mirror of Art, Oxford, 1967, Introduction.

46> Christopher Kent, op.cit, p32.

47> Arthur Aspinall, 'The Social Status of Journalists at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century', Review of English Studies, vol.21, 1945, p216.

48> Quoted by Philip Elliot in 'Professional ideology and organisational change: the journalist since 1800', Newspaper History - from the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day, edited by George Boyce et al, London, 1978, Chapter 9, p176.

49> C. E. Norton (ed.), Letters of Thomas Carlyle, 1826-1836, London, 1888, vol.1, p283.

50> Quoted in Arthur Aspinall, loc.cit..

51> L. O'Boyle, 'The image of the journalist in England, France and Germany, 1815-1848', Comparative Studies in Society and History, no.10, 1968, p313.

52> Philip Elliot, op.cit., p188.

53> Quoted by Alexander Andrews, op.cit., vol.2, p47.

54> Philip Elliot, op.cit., p173.

55> Joseph Farington, The Diary of Joseph Farington, K. Garlick et al (eds.), New Haven and London, 1978-1984, (9 June 1821).

56> Helene E. Roberts, 'Exhibition and review: the periodical press and the Victorian art exhibition system', in Joanne Shattock and Micahael Wolff (eds.) The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings, Leicester and Toronto, 1982, p96.

57> Sidney C. Hutchison, The History of the Royal Academy, London, 1968, p131.

58> George Boyce et al (eds.), Newspaper History from the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day, London, 1978, p109.

59> 'Art and Artists: A Conversation' (unsigned), The New Monthly Magazine, no.25, 1829, p567.

60> Clare Richter Sherman with Adele Holcomb, Women as Interpreters of the Visual Arts, 1820-1979, London, 1981.

61> See The Wellesley Index, vol.5, Epitome and Index, Toronto, 1989.

62> See Francis E. Mineka, The Dissidence of Dissent: The Monthly Repository, 1806-1838, North Carolina, 1944, p336.

63> J. H. Ramberg (1787), G. Sharf (1828) , W. P. Frith (1881) all illustrated in Giles Waterfield (ed.) Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain 1790-1990 (E.C.), (Dulwich Picture Gallery), London, 1991.

64> 'The New Gallery', The Artist, no.13, November 1892, p33.

Notes to pages 75-80

Chapter Three

1> DNB, and John Taylor, Records of My Life, London, 1832, vol.1, p3 and Kenneth Kendall, Leigh Hunt's Reflector, The Hague, 1971, p145.

2> Kendall, op.cit., pp145-147

3> William Jerdan, Autobiography of William Jerdan, London, 1852-3. This source is discussed further on pp90-98.

4> Taylor, op.cit,.

5> Kendall, loc.cit..

6> Stephen F. Fogle (ed.), Leigh Hunt's Autobiography. The Earliest Sketches, Florida, 1959, p6.

7> DNB and Ann Blainey, Immortal Boy, London, 1985, pp1-6.

8> Kendall, loc.cit..

9> J. E. Morpurgo (ed.), Autobiography of Leigh Hunt, London, 1948.

10> Fogle, op.cit, pp35-36.

11> Algernon Graves, The Royal Academy of Arts. A Complete Dictionary of Contributors, (1905), Bath, 1970.

12> Kendall, op.cit., pp146-147.

13> Ibid.

14> Morpurgo, op.cit..

15> Tom Taylor (ed.), Autobiography and Memoirs of Benjamin Robert Haydon, (1853), London, 1926.

16> Willard Bissell Pope (ed.), The Diary of B R Haydon, Cambridge, Mass., 1960.

17> Colbert Kearney, 'B R Haydon and The Examiner', Keats-Shelley Journal, 27, 1978, p128.

18> Ibid., p108.

19> Ibid., p121.

20> Ibid., p111.

21> See below p160-163.

22> Kearney, op.cit., pp111-112.

23> See his entry in Appendix III.

24> See below p199.

25> See below p116-117.

26> Kendall, loc.cit..

27> Joseph Farington, Diary of Joseph Farington, K. Garlick et al (eds.), New Haven and London, 1978-1984.

28> Farington is incorrect. As stated in Kendall's biographical sketch, its seems that unlike his younger brothers, Robert went to a day school in Finchley, not the Blue Coat School [Christ's Hospital].

29> Kendall, loc.cit..

30> Cyrus Redding, Recollections, London, 1958, vol.2, p169.

31> The most notable resemblance is one of content, more than style. Like Hunt's Examiner review of 1821 (see below p162), The New Monthly Magazine is generally well-disposed towards the exhibition and optimistic. However, in keeping with Hunt's known views as expressed in The Examiner, The New Monthly's review finds it necessary to point out that, such progress as has been made, has been the consequence of individual endeavour, without the help of the government:

> This is a cheering view of the subject (i.e. that the fine arts seem to be improving), and it will add to its value that all has been the result of individual effort, unbacked by the patronage of government, but supported by a few noblemen and gentlemen of distinguished taste and liberality towards art. Unlike other governments of Europe, which have schools of art in Italy at the national expense, and have thrown every possible facility that power and munificence could add into the scale of its support, ours has kept aloof, and seen its artists forcing their way to excellence by individual exertion, aided by the co-operation of a few superior spirits, and reaping the fruit of popular and not ministerial patronage. The New Monthly Magazine, July 1821, p335.

The attack on the government is notably milder than some of the attacks in The Examiner. This can be explained by the fact that up until 1821 (when Campbell took over as editor) The New Monthly had been pretty ardently Tory. Subsequently, the magazine became more liberal, but it would not have been fitting or consistent to have expressed strong anti-government sentiments in a periodical which up to that point had been of the opposite political persuasion.

32> The statistical technique of generalised linear regression shows that the works of art and artists common to both The Examiner's and The New Monthly Magazine's reviews in 1821 is greater than that predicted (using the other years to arrive at this prediction). The probability of the actual figure occurring is extremely low. I thank James Lynn for applying his statistical expertise to my figures.

33> Michael Rosenthal, Constable, London, 1987.
Ann Bermingham, 'Reading Constable', Art History, vol.10, no.1, March 1987.

34> Judy Crosby Ivy, Constable and the Critics, (1991), p30.

35> J. G. Legge, 'The Examiner and William Blake', London Mercury, 20 May 1929, p70-71.

36> Edmund Blunden, Leigh Hunt's Examiner Examined, (Archon Books), U.S.A., 1967, p9.

37> G. E. Bentley (Jnr.), Blake Records, Oxford, 1969, p215.

38> DNB and John Taylor, op.cit., vol.1, p3.

39> Taylor, op.cit., vol.1, p280.

40> Ibid., vol.1, p3.

41> Ibid., vol.1, p24.

42> Ibid., vol.2, p284.

43> DNB.

44> Taylor, op.cit., vol.2, pp265-267.

45> Ibid., vol.2, p268.

46> Farington, op.cit., (29 April 1795).

47> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.2, p157.

48> Farington, op.cit., (29 April 1804).

49> Arthur Aspinall, Politics and The Press, (1949), Brighton, 1973, p79.

50> DNB.

51> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.1, p157.

52> Farington, op.cit., (1 May 1809).

53> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.1, p157.

54> Farington, op.cit., (20 June 1815).

55> Farington, op.cit., (15 April 1817 and 17 April 1817)
Taylor, op.cit., vol.2, pp351-2.

56> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.2, pp69-71.

57> Ibid., vol.2, pp77-79.

58> Ibid., pp137-160.

59> Ibid., pp146-147.

60> Ibid., p158.

61> Ibid., p74.

62> Brian Allen, Francis Hayman, New Haven and London, 1987, pp166-167 reproduces a broadsheet of 'Frank Hayman; a tale...Written by John Taylor, Esquire, Author of Monsieur Tonson' (another story concerning Hayman and a hare, not a lion) which was illustrated by Isaac Cruikshank. Allen misattributes the poem to Hayman's pupil John Taylor.

63> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.2, p72.

64> Taylor, op.cit., vol.1, p380.

65> Gentleman's Magazine, 1832, Part 2, pp89-90.

66> A review of Records of My Life in Gentleman's Magazine (1832, Part 2, p542) noted, 'of himself he has recorded little, and that little without the usual exactness of self-love'.

67> Compare vol.1, p299, with vol.2, p229 and vol.1, p392, with vol.2, p28.

68> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.2, pp72-73.

69> Ibid., p73.

70> Farington, op.cit., (30 April 1806).

71> T. Sadler (ed.), Diary, Reminiscences and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson, London, 1872, (3rd edition), vol.2, p254.

72> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.2, p72.

73> Ibid., p73.

74> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.2, p72.
It may be that Taylor was suffering from some form of depressive mental illness, of which one of the symptoms was paranoia. It might help to explain aspects of his behaviour, particularly his need to flatter people - stemming from his insecurity and desperate desire to be liked.

75> Jerdan, op.cit., p74.

76> Ibid. p75.

77> See above p89.

78> The Examiner's prospectus as well as being published separately was included as part of the first Examiner, 3 January 1808, p7.

79> The Sun, 17 June 1811.

80> Very occasionally the Sun made comparative remarks in consecutive critiques. On one of these rare occasions, it published consecutive critiques of Dubost's *Mrs T Hope* and the same subject by Shee, implying that in general it avoided 'comparative criticism' because it was aware of the 'proverbial prejudice' against it, but that it would have been an 'affectation' to avoid it in the present instance (the Sun, 14 May 1808). This contrasts with Hunt, who strongly defended the use of critical comparisons between living artists (see below pp200-201)

81> See below p129

82> Excepting the years 1815 and 1816 which were untypical and are discussed further on pp128-134.

83> Andrew Hemingway, Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteenth Century Britain, Cambridge, 1992, p110.

84> Aspinall, op.cit., p79.

85> Ibid., p80.

86> Ibid., p185.

87> Quoted in Aspinall, op.cit., pp81-82.

88> Quoted in Aspinall, ibid., p83.

89> See above p93.

90> Quoted in Aspinall, ibid., p184.

91> The Sun, 20 June 1815, quoted in Aspinall, ibid., p185.

92> Aspinall, ibid..

93> H. R. Fox-Bourne, English Newspapers: Chapters in the History of Journalism, London, 1887, p354.

94> Mary Moorman (ed.), The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth, (revised edition), Oxford, 1969, vol.3, part 2, p485. (William Wordsworth to Viscount Lowther, 22 September 1818).

95> Farington, op.cit., (4 May 1795).

96> Aspinall, op.cit., p79.

97> See above p90

98> Elliot, op.cit., p173.

99> John O. Hayden, The Romantic Reviewers, London, 1969, p8.

100> Ibid., p11.

101> Ibid., p2.

102> Edmund Blunden in Leigh Hunt. A Biography, London, 1930, p8, tells us that John was nine years older than Leigh who was born in 1784. Kenneth Kendall suggested that Robert was born in 1774. See p76 above.

103> Hayden, op.cit., p9.

104> See note 78 above.

105> Richard D. Altick, The English Common Reader, Chicago, 1963, p342.

106> Moorman, op.cit., vol.3, Part 2, p568. (William Wordsworth to Visount Lowther, December 1819).

107> The Literary Gazette, 16 June 1821, p382.

108> The History of The Times, London, 1935, vol.1, p20.

109> George Dumas Stout, The Political History of Leigh Hunt's Examiner, St. Louis, 1949.

110> Hemingway, op.cit., pp115-125.

111> Stout, op.cit., pp3-4.

112> Hemingway, op.cit., p31.

113> J. E. Morpurgo (ed.), The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt, London, 1948, p243.

Notes to pages 116-122

114> Stout, op.cit., pp9-10, p13.

115> J. D. Symon, The Press and its Story, London, 1914, p168.

116> This painter was P. E. Stroehling. See William Whitley, Art in England, (1928), New York, 1973, vol.1, p216 [Whitley incorrectly gives Stroehling's initials as P. A.]

117> See for instance:
Peter Funnell, 'Richard Payne Knight. Aspects of Aesthetics and Art Criticism in Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century England', unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford, 1985, Chapts.3 and 5.
John Barrell, The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt, New Haven and London, 1986, Chapter 5.
Andrew Hemingway, Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteenth Century Britain, Cambridge, 1992, Chapter 6.

118> Donald Drew Egbert, Social Radicalism and the Arts, London, 1970, Chapter 7, p390.

119> Particularly those authors cited for note 117 above.

120> Hemingway, op.cit., p117.

121> Ibid., pp118-119.

122> For Robert Hunt's changing attitude towards to Royal Academy see below pp160-163

123> Hemingway, op.cit., p121.

124> This statement is slightly misleading since Hunt, in spite of acknowledging the unfavourable circumstances, did apportion some of the blame on the Royal Academicians who he thought ought to have been aiming at higher things than mere portraiture (see below p161)

125> Hemingway, op.cit., pp121-122.

126> Ibid., p125.

127> Ibid.

128> See below pp206-208.

129> Altick, op.cit., p392.

130> Stout, op.cit., p5 and Farington op.cit., (3 December 1812).

131> Stout, op.cit., p37.

132> Hayden, op.cit., p67.

133> Edmund Blunden, Leigh Hunt's Examiner Examined, (Archon Books), U.S.A., 1967, p99.

134> Stout, op.cit., p37.

135> Ibid., p37.

136> Quoted from The Life and Labours of Albany Fonblanque, London, 1874, pp25-28.

137> Altick, op.cit., p392.

138> Ibid. p329.

139> See above p84.

140> Ibid. p355.

141> Ibid. p392.

142> Francis E. Mineka, The Dissidence of Dissent. The Monthly Repository 1806-1838, North Carolina, 1944, p56.

143> Ibid. p393.

144> Quoted in Lucy Brown, Victorian News and Newspapers, Oxford, 1985, p27.

145> British Museum ADD.MSS 39781, fol.299

146> The 18 June 1815 instalment of Robert Hunt's Royal Academy review was the last to be published that year, although it indicates that another was intended.

147> A. J. Finberg, Life of J M W Turner, Oxford, 1961.

148> Martin Butlin and Evelyn Joll, The Paintings of J M W Turner, New Haven and London, 1984, p76.
John Gage, Collected Correspondence of J M W Turner, Oxford, 1980, p48.

149> It must be emphasised that this stylistic analysis is based only on the Sun's Royal Academy reviews. As we have noticed, the Sun did offer a brief report on the British Institution and occasionally published other news on the fine arts. It is acknowledged that some of these may have been by other hands. In fact, it is known that Boaden wrote a report of one of Opie's Royal Academy lectures which was published in the Sun in 1804: Farington, Diary, 17 May 1804. As the Sun's Royal Academy reviews represent its main commentary on the fine arts each year, and the bulk of evidence suggest that Taylor was their author, it is suggested that he was the principal art critic.

150> In his opening remarks in this year, the critic stated that 'it must be acknowledged that THE ART has not made any important advances' [the Sun, 28 April 1794]. In his second instalment he characteristically commented 'that such of the regular Artists of the Academy as have thought proper to come forward this year, do not fall below the standard of their reputation, and that the other Painters of well-known merit have displayed their talents with increased success', but again suggested that there had been 'no striking advancement of the Art' [the Sun, 29 April 1794]

151> The Sun, 28 April 1800.

152> The Sun, 2 May 1808.

153> The Sun, 29 April 1811.

154> The Sun, 3 May 1817.

155> The Sun, 3 May 1813.

156> The Sun, 27 April 1801.

157> The Sun, 28 April 1810.

158> The Sun, 2 May 1820.

159> For example, The New Monthly Magazine's Royal Academy reviews from 1814 to 1818 (approximately the middle of the period in which critic A was working) do not make any use of the adjective 'manly' to describe colouring. Appendix V shows that 'manly' was also not very popular with Robert Hunt.

160> The Sun, 26 May 1795.

161> The Sun, 18 May 1797.

162> The Sun, 13 May 1799.

163> The Sun, 22 May 1801.

164> The Sun, 18 June 1810.

165> The Sun, 2 May 1811.

166> The Sun, 28 May 1813.

167> The Sun, 21 May 1818.

168> The Sun, 5 May 1815; 23 May 1815; 9 June 1815; 18 May 1816; 30 May 1816; 4 June 1816.

169> The review in question was published on 29 April, and on 2 May 1820, the critic remarked 'The brief notice that was inserted in our paper of Saturday [i.e. 29 April] was taken from a Morning Paper of that day'.

170> The Sun, 3 May 1815.

171> For examples, see The Sun, 29 April 1809; 2 May 1812; 3 May 1817.

172> The Sun, 3 May 1815.

173> The Sun, 6 May 1818.

174> See his entry in Appendix III and pp247-249.

175> See below p136.

176> Taylor, op.cit., vol.2, p129.

177> Ibid., vol.2, p239.

178> Ibid., vol.2, p288.

179> Ibid., vol.1, p281.

180> The Sun, 2 May 1804.

181> The Sun, 5 May 1804.

182> The Sun, 5 May 1804.

183> In 1799 for instance, The Sun, 13 May 1799 and the True Briton, 4 May 1799 are the same. Cobbett's short lived Tory newspaper the Porcupine 1800-1802 also published some of the Sun's critiques: this may simply have been a case of copying, perhaps with prior agreement, since both papers were of the same political persuasion.

184> Taylor, op.cit., vol.1, p300.

185> The Sun, 6 May 1818: 'A Subject from Dante. H. FUSELI, R.A. There are generally proofs of a pregnant mind in the works of this Artist, and his subjects are well suited to the peculiar turn of his imagination.'

186> Taylor, op.cit., vol.1, p301.

187> The reverse was also true: Taylor was one of Farington's principal connections with the press world and on one occasion drew to his attention, and offered to counter an attack on the R.A. in another paper. See Farington's Diary, 17, 18, 19, 24, 27, 28 June 1805.

188> Taylor, op.cit., vol.1, p301.

189> John Taylor, 'A Modern Critic' in Poems on Various Subjects by John Taylor, Esq., London, 1827.

190> Taylor, op.cit., (1832), vol.2, p247.

191> Ibid., vol.1, p280.

192> Ibid., vol.2, p139.

193> The Sun, 23 May 1814 and 6 May 1814.

194> The Sun, 3 May 1803 [Portrait of Lord Thurlow by Lawrence].

195> The Sun, 6 May 1818.

196> The Sun, 21 May 1806.

197> The Sun, 8 May 1806.

198> Graves, op.cit.

199> The Sun, 8 May 1806.

200> The Sun, 6 May 1806.

201> The Sun, 3 May 1806.

202> For a couple of examples see: the Sun, 25 May 1795 and 30 April 1811.

203> The Sun, 2 May 1807.

204> The Sun, 27 May 1807.

205> The occasions on which Callcott's works are mentioned in the Sun are: 3,5,12,23,27 May, 9 June 1806; 24 April, 2 May 1807; 28 April, 18 June 1810; 29 April 1811; 2,7,26 May 1812; 5 May 1818; 2 May 1820; 4 May 1822; 1 May 1814.

206> The Sun, 2 May 1807.

207> The Sun, 24 April 1807.

208> The Sun, 26 May 1797 [Her Majesty by Beechey].

209> Farington, op.cit., (8 June 1810).

210> Finberg, op.cit., p167 and Butlin and Joll, op.cit., 1984, pp74-77.

211> The Sun, 18 May 1797.

212> The Sun, 17 May 1802.

213> The Sun, 16 May 1806.

214> The Sun, 4 May 1809.

215> Taylor, op.cit., (1832), vol.2, p59.

216> Ibid., vol.2, p256.

217> Gage, op.cit., pp45-49.

Chapter Four

1> See above pp105-107.

2> For instance, V&A Press Cuttings (P.P17G), vol.1:
p103 The Public Advertiser 1774 (undated)
p189 The London Courant 3 May 1780.

3> The Examiner, 2 July 1809, p425, The Examiner, 16 August 1812, p521.

4> Academic Annals, 1808, p23.

5> Academic Annals, 1809, pvii.

6> Frasers Magazine, no.2, August 1830, p96. Attributed to W. H. Leeds in The Wellesley Index.

7> The Morning Chronicle, 2 May 1781.

8> The Morning Chronicle, May 3 1814. See P. P. Howe, The Complete Works of William Hazlitt, Vol.18.

9> The New Monthly Magazine, 1 June 1820, p716.

10> The Examiner, May 12 1822, p301.

11> Helene E. Roberts, 'Art Reviewing in the Early Nineteenth Century Art Periodicals, Victorian Periodicals Newsletter, no.19, March 1973.

12> The Examiner, 29 April 1810, p268.

13> The Examiner, 18 May 1817, p319.

14> The Examiner, 11 May 1823, p313.

15> The Examiner, 8 May 1825, p289.

16> Thereby assigning no small significance to his own role.

17> The Examiner, 13 May 1827, p291.

18> The Examiner, 9 June 1816, p363.

19> The Examiner, 19 July 1812, p463.

20> The Examiner, 31 May 1818, p317.

21> The Examiner, 21 June 1818, p397.

22> The Examiner, 3 July 1814, p432.
John Bull which the Times described as having been 'established for the express purpose of libelling private character' (quoted by Arthur Aspinall in 'The Social Status of Journalists at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century', Review of English Studies, vol.21, 1945, p218) seemed to show little restraint on the occasions when it did the reverse: e.g. 'The President [Thomas Lawrence] has... contrived to instil intellect into the countenance of the DUKE OF BEDFORD, and yet preserve a resemblance; the silly shape of the head, however, even the artist could not conceal', John Bull, 12 May 1822, p589

23> The Sun, 6 May 1806.

24> The Examiner, 6 June 1813, p364.

25> The Examiner, 15 May 1808, p316.

26> The Examiner, 22 June 1823, p411.

27> e.g. The Sun, 4 May 1799 and 1 May 1801.

28> The Sun, 29 May 1806.

29> Robert R. Wark (ed.), Reynolds' Discourses, California, 1959, Fourth Discourse, line 451.

30> The Examiner, 18 May 1828, p326.

31> The Examiner, 16 June 1816, p380.

32> The Examiner, 4 July 1819, p429.

33> The Examiner, 13 June 1813, p378.

34> The Examiner, 15 July 1827, p438.

35> The Examiner, 1 June 1817. In fact Hunt misrepresented Landseer by this statement, who did not complain of Reynolds' lax principles. It was Gilpin whom he blamed for encouraging a fashion for sketchiness and Reynolds to whom he looked as an authority:
Sir Joshua Reynolds says that "we are to consider rules as

fences, to be placed where trespass is expected, and enforced in proportion as peculiar faults are prevalent at the time in which they are delivered; for what it may be proper strongly to recommend or enforce in one age, may not with equal propriety be so much laboured in another". The fashion of the present day runs in favour of slight, sketchy performances. The Rev. Mr. Gilpin's principles of art obtained a too ready admission within the hgher circles, because they were easy and flattered the vanities of those who with little effort could acquire a certain ignorant rambling of the hand and pencil, with an opinion that they could draw.

John Landseer, Lectures on the Art of Engraving delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, London, 1807, pp145-146.

36> The Examiner, 24 June 1827, p395.

37> Quoted in John Barrell, The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt, New Haven and London, 1986, p319.

38> Ibid. pp326-7. Although Barrell quotes from Hazlitt's Encyclopaedia article, it is particularly relevant to note in the context of this study that Hazlitt had used the arguments earlier in his article 'On the Imitation of Nature' published in The Champion, 25 December 1814.

39> Barrell, op.cit., p310.

40> Ibid. pp327-330.

41> The Sun, 27 May 1807.

42> The Sun, 29 April 1796.

43> The Sun, 12 May 1804.

44> John Taylor, Records of My Life, London, 1832, vol.1, p195.

45> See above p153.

46> An additional twenty-two words formed part of Taylor's occasional vocabulary, but were not used with any regularity. They comprise: brilliant, capital, characteristic, excellent, exquisite, fanciful, glittering, glowing, lovely, magnificent, modest, novel, original, peculiar, plain, playful, romantic, shewy, stately, tasteful.

47> The Sun, 22 May 1801.

48> The Sun, 2 May 1811.

49> The Sun, 17 May 1802.

50> The Sun, 15 May 1801, 6 May 1806, 3 May 1803.

51> e.g. The Sun, 23 May 1808.

52> 'Vulgar' could of course, be used neutrally, to mean 'common' or 'every-day': genre scenes for instance, were sometimes described as 'scenes of vulgar life'. 'Negligent' when applied to drapery and attitudes simply meant free from artificiality. Only when applied to drawing, handling and finishing did its meaning become pejorative.

53> The Sun, 27 May 1807.

54> As discussed in Sam Smiles, '"Splashers", "Scrawlers", and "Plasterers": British Landscape Painting and the Language of Criticism', Turner Studies, vol.10, no.1, Summer 1990 and further on pp234-235.

55> Discussed further in Chapter Five below.

56> Some of these points are touched on again on pp205-6 and pp241-245.

57> The Sun 20 May 1818.

58> The Sun, 17 May 1808.

59> The Sun, 22 May 1818.

60> A interesting transitional stage in the gradual abandonment of the hierarchy of genres is demonstrated by some of the exhibition reviews which were published in The London Magazine. Its first editor, John Scott, for instance, was a great admirer of Wilkie and devoted four and a half pages (nearly his entire 1820 Royal Academy review) pouring effusions on *The Reading of a Will.* Although he had not fully given up the idea of the superiority of History Painting ('High excellence in the highest style, we would of course, put first'), he felt that Wilkie's ability to portray 'nature' (not to be confused with his skill in portraying the 'material' parts of the scene, such as the dress or furniture) entitled him to be rated as a genius. In spite of questioning the value of doing so, Scott spent over a page attempting to describe the characters and incidents of the scene. The London Magazine, June 1820, pp695-700.

A later (anonymous and unidentified) writer in The London Magazine who reviewed Haydon's picture of *Chairing the Members*, remarked that it was 'certainly a high work of art' and suggested that 'an heroic subject' was not 'essentially necessary to the development of the very highest imaginative powers'. Although, like Scott, this reviewer held on to a faint belief in the importance of history painting - the fame which Haydon would achieve by painting such subjects as that under review would not be 'quite so high, perhaps, as that of being the first historical painter of the age' - the reviewer nevertheless strongly recommended that Haydon kept to them. The London Magazine, November 1828, pp507-516.

Judith Fisher's article on Thackeray's periodical art criticism

(in the late 1830s and 1840s) points to 'his rejection of the heroic sublime in favour of mediocre of beautiful art' and refers to his admiration of pictures like Maclise's *Gil Blas*. According to Thackeray, this work depicted 'a poached egg which one could swallow; a trout, that beats all the trout that was ever seen; a copper pan, scoured so clean that you might see your face in it; a green blind, through which the sun comes; and a wall, with the sun shining on it, that De Hooghe could not surpass'. 'The Aesthetic of the Mediocre: Thackeray and the Visual Arts', Victorian Studies vol.26, no.1, 1982, p65 and p77.

61> The Examiner, 16 May 1819, p318.

62> See Martin Butlin and Evelyn Joll, The Paintings of J M W Turner, New Haven and London, 1984, pp52-3.

63> The Sun, 6 May 1806.

64> The Sun, 5 May 1807.

65> The Sun, 10 May 1808.

66> The Sun, 11 May 1818.

67> Robert Wark (ed.), Reynolds' Discourses, Fourth Discourse, line 233.

68> Ibid. Fourth Discourse, line 334.

69> Ibid. Third Discourse, line 341.

70> Andrew Hemingway, Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteen Century Britain, Chapters Four and Five.

71> The Sun, 17 May 1799.

72> The Examiner, 27 May 1821, p331.

73> The Sun, 26 May 1818.

74> See above p153.

75> Taylor op.cit., vol. 1, p216.

76> Butlin and Joll, op.cit..

77> The Sun, 1 May 1801.

78> The Sun, 17 May 1802.

79> The Sun, 3 May 1803.

80> The Sun, 10 May 1804.

81> The Star, 8 May 1801, see Butlin and Joll op.cit., pp14-15.

82> The Monthly Mirror, June 1802, see Butlin and Joll op.cit., pp16-17.

83> Bultin and Joll, op.cit., pp80-81, pp90-91, pp101-105.

84> The Sun, 30 June 1817.

85> Judy Crosby Ivy, Constable and the Critics, Woodbridge, 1991, pp73-74.

86> Poems on Various Subjects by John Taylor, London, 1827.

87> Taylor was especially attached to the method of examining works of art using the traditional principles of academic theory. This was less so with other critics, including Hunt, who included different types of responses in his reviews (see below p2052-206).

88> See above pp135-136.

89> The Sun, 26 May 1802.

90> The Sun, 4 June 1806.

91> The Sun, 23 May 1818.

92> The Sun, 6 May 1818 (This review is missing from Ivy's collection).

93> Ivy op.cit., p66.

94> The Sun, 3 May 1800.

95> The Sun, 4 June 1808.

96> e.g. Miss Gouldsmith's *Fisherman's Cottage* 'is forcible without violence, delicate without tameness, rich without gaudiness, elegant without affectation. Her style is so accordant to the truth of Nature, that though one or two of our best painters possess perhaps more genius, not one of them has so little of what is denominated manner. An unaffected simplicity shines in her delicate pencilling, her deep toned fore-grounds, her light, aerial distances, her silver tinted skies. I say *perhaps* more genius, because she is at present so youthful that many years must elapse before we can decide on the maturity of her powers. Her colouring is clear, and its various hues so tastefully intermixed and balanced, that there is none of that disagreeable predominance of a particular colour, so common to most landscape painters. The foliage of her trees is variously elegant and tasteful. Her choice of subject is the amentity of rural nature.' The Examiner, 17 June 1810, p379.

97> The Examiner, 20 May 1821, p317.

98> The Examiner, 8 May 1825, p290.

99> The Examiner, 14 May 1826, p306.

100> Hemingway, op.cit., p44.

101> The Examiner, 5 July 1812, p428 [*Chief of the Macdonell's* by Raeburn].

102> e.g. The Sun, 15 May 1801, 'It is indeed a very interesting work, and, though, a Portrait, is painted in a picturesque and poetical style' [*Portrait of the Hon. Sophia Upton*, by Lawrence] The Sun, 2 May 1807, 'SHEE fully sustains his credit, and gives to portraits a picturesque beauty that might be expected from his poetical taste...'

103> See above p169 and The Examiner, 29 May 1814, p349.

104> Landseer, op.cit., pp169-172.

105> The Examiner, 10 May 1812, p302; 19 July 1812, p463, (twice); 18 May 1817, p319; 9 June 1822, p365.

106> The Examiner, 9 June 1822, p365.

107> Further discussion of the problem of 'jargon' is given in Chapter Five below.

108> The Sun, 10 May 1802.

109> William Carey, A Desultory Exposition of an Anti-British System of Incendiary Publication, London, 1819, was written as a reply to the attack.

110> Haydon is quoted by Carey, op.cit., p11.

111> Including Northcote and Opie.

112> Carey, op.cit., p14-19.

113> Ibid., p14.

114> J. Harris, Lexicon Technicum, London, 1704-10, vol.1. 'Carnation, is a Term in Painting, signifying such Parts of an Human Body as are drawn naked, without any Drapery; or what express the bare Flesh; and when this is done, Natural, Bold, and Strong, and is well coloured, they say of the Painter, that his carnation is very good'.

115> Ibid., vol.2. 'Claro-obscuro, is a Term in Painting and signifies the Art of distributing Lights and Shadows advantageously, as well on particular Objects as on a Picture in general. On particular Objects 'tis necessay to give them an agreeable Roundness and convenient Relieve; and in the Picture in general, to expose the Object with Pleasure to the View of the Spectators, by giving the Eye an Occasion to rest; which is best done by a happy Distribution of great Lights and Shadows, which by their opposition set off one another'.

116> A. E. Wallace Maurer (ed.), The Works of John Dryden, California, 1989, vol.20, p133.

117> The Examiner, 29 May 1814 was, as far as I have been able to locate, the last time that Hunt used the first person singular in a Royal Academy review.

118> e.g. The Examiner, 22 May 1808, pp332-333.

119> The Examiner, 20 May 1810, p315.

120> The Examiner, 14 July 1822, p443.

121> The Examiner, 1 July 1827, p404.

122> The Examiner, 22 June 1827, p405.

123> The Examiner, 4 June 1815, p366.

124> The Examiner, 23 June 1816, p398.

125> See above pp55-56.

126> The Examiner, 7 July 1822, p428.

127> The Examiner, 8 July 1827, p419.

128> The Examiner, 26 May 1816, p333.

129> The Examiner, 7 June 1812, p363.

130> 'The drawing is masterly' (The Examiner, 8 May 1808, p300).
'The figures are well drawn and judiciously disposed. The artist has thrown some of them into shadow in a masterly manner' (The Sun, 3 May 1810).
'This...is a work of a very masterly description' (The Sun, 30 April 1811).

131> 'A warm, yellow sky, pleasingly gradates from the right side into the bluish tinted left' (The Examiner, 4 June 1809, p367).
'The distances are admirably gradated, and the whole is airy, bright and pleasing' (The Sun, 27 May 1806).

Notes to pages 204-205

132> 'The pencilling and finishing are firm and neat' (The Examiner, 17 June 1810, p380).
'The general execution is neat, without elaborate precision' (The Sun, 29 May 1806).
'It is painted with a firm pencil, and it is characterized by force and harmony of colouring' (The Sun, 9 June 1806).

133> 'His likenesses are strong, his colouring rich, mellow and harmonious, and his attitudes easy and graceful' (The Examiner, 28 June 1812, p414).
'The likeness is exact...and the colouring is throughout clear and harmonious' (The Sun, 17 May 1802).
'The attitude is easy and graceful' (The Sun, 3 May 1803).

134> 'The colouring and effect is chastely vivid' (The Examiner, 15 May 1814, p317).
'The colouring is vivid, yet chaste' (The Sun, 3 May 1803).
'A chaste yet vivid colouring' (The Sun, 4 May 1811).

135> 'A pleasingly clear and forcible effect' (The Examiner, 26 June 1814, p414).
'The colouring is clear, vivid and, forcible' (The Sun, 10 May 1804).

136> 'A strong likeness, a well selected and easy posture, a forcible and agreeable effect of light, shade, and colour' (The Examiner, 29 June 1817, p414).
' A very exact and spirited likeness... it is painted with boldness, with a fine breadth of light, and with great truth and clearness of colouring' (The Sun, 24 May 1808).

137> 'His various draperies are tastefully adjusted and well characterized' (The Examiner, 29 June 1817, p415).
'The figures are well disposed and characteristically designed' The Sun, 27 May 1806).
'The drapery is well arranged' (The Sun, 18 June 1810).

138> 'The handling is firm, the colour and chiaroscuro rich and strong, the look manly and martial' (The Examiner, 4 July 1819, p430).
'A fine breadth of light and shadow, and a richness of colouring, mark the whole' (The Sun, 18 May 1797).
'the air is martial without affectation... the colouring is chaste and manly' (The Sun, 4 May 1799).

139> 'There is an extraordinary vigour of chiaro-scuro and colour' (The Examiner, 10 June 1821, p364).
'A bold breadth of shadow is finely pourtrayed in this production' (The Sun, 16 May 1799).

140> 'The tasteful disposal of their dresses (The Examiner, 1 July 1821, p412).
'The figure is elegant and gracefully disposed' (The Sun, 3 May 1798).
'The draperies are very well-disposed' (The Sun, 23 May 1808).

141> 'Splendid colour and beautiful execution' (The Examiner, 17 July 1825, p448).
'A spirited whole-length...coloured with great splendour (The Sun, 7 May 1804).

142> e.g. 'Blue, purple, orange, red, brown, green, and white, can scarcely be agreeably connected in a small group of four figures. The fault is, however, more in their arrangement than in their introduction. The figure of Eurydice in the centre of the piece, on whom the chief light and attention are placed, ought not to have had the purple and green draperies. Some of the red that is in other parts of the picture should have enriched this most important part.'
[*Arideus and Eurydice* by A. Perigal], The Examiner, 9 June 1811, p367.

143> 'The concealed face and confusion of the young lady at the moment of her appearing before her parents, the fainting of her sister, overpowered with affectionate emotions and joy at her return, the concern of her mother while assisting her fainting daughter, the respectful restoration of the heiress to her father by his friend, and the unrelenting and averted face of the enraged father, are highly natural and forcibly designed incidents.' [*The run away Heiress returned to her friends* by M. W. Sharp], The Examiner, 31 May 1812, p347.

144> 'The fluency of pencil, the clearness of the carnations... which *Ganymede* beautifully relieves, in a bright mass of colour, from the rich mingling of dark hues that form the surrounding shade on the Eagle.' [*Ganymede* by W. Hilton], The Examiner, 23 May 1819, p335.

145> 'The colours are well mingled into a dun and natural hue, which hovers over nearly the whole scene, giving it a soft solemnity, and to which the yellow-edged turrets, hills, and clouds, oppose a delicate sprightliness...' [*Morning in Italy* by W. Allston], The Examiner, 16 June 1816, p380.

146> 'MR. FRADELLE... lays on his colours, as if smoothness was an article of orthodox religious practice in Painting.' [*Milton dictating Paradise Lost to his Daughter* by H. J. Fradelle], The Examiner, 25 May 1817, p332.

147> 'It is Poetry spread before us, and rebounding in our breasts with pity, admiration, beauty and nature, from the canvas. Whatever defect it may have, it makes its way to the inmost heart the moment it is seen, and prevents the judgment from hesitating til it has the cautious assent of criticism. Judgment indeed soon, if not at once, coalesces with the feelings; they stamp their combined decision on the heart, and leave a delightful and enduring impression.' [*Una with the Satyrs* by W. Hilton], The Examiner, 17 May 1818, p315.

148> 'Four men are described gaming at cards. The successful partners are exulting in their good fortune. One, looking joyfully, is shewing his all powerful hand to a rustic who leans on the back of his chair, in an attitude of card contemplation. As he must not speak, he acknowledges the excellence of the hand by a significant compressure of lip. The lucky partner, with a similarly joyful countenance, is recalling his attention to the game, and showing him the victorious state of a trick to which he is to be last player. The face of the luckless opponent, soured by ill luck, and frowning with disappointed avarice, looks woefully at his partner, who is scratching his head with equal mortification at his ill-starred fate.' [*Card Players* by D. Wilkie], The Examiner, 8 May 1808, p300.

149> The Examiner, 20 May 1821, p317.

150> The Examiner, 27 June 1819, p414.

Chapter Five

1> Andrew Hemingway, Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteenth Century Britain, Cambridge, 1992, p146.

2> Thomas Griffiths Wainewright's rambling conversational style was an imaginative way of overcoming this:
.....Nevertheless, here I am in London; have been twice to Somerset House; and now I must flourish my goose feather. What a miserable wretch is he who hath the practice of painting; and how doubly miserable to be obliged to show it in criticisms! Instead of placidly admiring, like the happy ignorant in these matters, the pictures which please him, he worries himself and others to death about some error in perspective, some weakness in drawing, a slight deficiency in keeping, or some unhappiness in the touch or surface, which no one else in the world can see but himself. I myself am as bigoted to all this delightful trumpery as any body ever was; yet I loathe writing on it; still it must be done....Lo! here is that useful member of the Academy, Samuel Stronger, with his gracious nod - there, dark under the stream of light, rest Alcides...and before me winds the stair, with ladies ascending and descending, like the Angels in Jacob's dream. "With your leave, good Sir, Madam, or Miss, I will halt on the first floor, and enter the Library." Let

us look at 1080, by Gandy.....We are now in the great room, reader, where, if you have no objection, we will sit down behind this gay party, who seem to be dealing about their remarks as freely as you and I do... The London Magazine, July 1821, pp68-71.

3> Earl of Shaftsbury, Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times, London, 1711.

4> Lord Kames, Elements of Criticism, London, 1762.

5> Hemingway, op.cit., particularly Chapters 4 and 5, also by the same author 'Academic Theory versus Association Aesthetics: The Ideological Forms of Conlict of Interests in the Early Nineteenth Century', Ideas and Production, no.5, 1986.
Peter D. Funnell, 'Richard Payne Knight: Aspects of Aesthetics and Art Criticism in Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century England', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1985.
Helene E. Roberts 'Trains of Fascinating and of Endless Imagery: Associationist Art Criticism Before 1850', Victorian Peridicals Review, vol.10, no3, 1977.

6> Catalogue of the British Library.

7> J. Harris, Lexicon Techicum or a Universal English Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, London, 1704-10.

8> Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, London, 1754.

9> Chambers Encyclopaedia, London, 1781.

10> John Barrell, The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt, New Haven and London, 1986.

11> Moshe Barasch, Theories of Art from Plato to Winckelmann, New York, 1985, p34.

12> William Aglionby, Painting Illustrated in Three Dialogues Containing some Choice Observations upon the Art, London, 1685.

13> Jonathan Richardson, Two Discourses (1719), Menston, 1972.

14> Ibid., Introduction by Richard Woodfield.

15> Aglionby, op.cit., p4.

16> Ibid., pp99-100.

17> Ibid., p109.

18> Ibid., p112.

19> Richardson, op.cit., vol.1, p189.

20> Ibid., vol.2, p65.

21> Louise Lippincott, The Career of Arthur Pond, New Haven and London, 1983.

22> N. Penny et al, Reynolds (E.C.), London, 1986, pp18-19.

23> Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, 1954, entry for 'Painting'.

24> Further discussion of this is given below pp226-7.

25> Harris, op.cit..

26> F. W. Fairholt, A Dictionary of of Terms in Art, London, 1854.

27> Lawrence Lipking, The Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth Century England, Princeton, 1970, p39.

28> e.g. Harris' entry for Design: 'Design in Painting or Sculpture is the Expression of the Images or Ideas that the Painter hath conceived in his Mind, on the Picture &c and it is Good, when the Author has a good Gusto and correct Judgment: This is the Basis and Foundation of all other Parts, an may be compared to the stile of a correct Writer. But the Painters call Designs chiefly such Draughts as they ususally express on Paper, in order to the Performance of some considerable Piece of Work: A feint imperfect Design is usually called a sketch.
Fairholt's entry for Design: 'The Art of Illusion. A design is a figure traced in outline, without relief being expressed by light and shade. Also a sketch in water-colour, in thich the chiaroscuro is expressed by Indian ink, sepia, or bistre; or a sketch in which the object represented is clothed in its proper colours. DESIGN is sometimes used synonymously with SKETCH, STUDY, to indicate the first composition for a picture, &c.; here it embodies all the inventive genius of the artist - INVENTION, COMPOSITION, COLOURING, &c., and is preliminary to the execution of the work on the chosen scale.

29> Ralph N. Wornum, Lectures on Painting by the Royal Academicians, London and Bohn, 1848.

30> A. E. Wallace-Maurer (ed.), The Works of John Dryden, (translation of du Fresnoy, 1695), California, 1989, vol.20, pp198-209.

31> Aglionby, op.cit., pp72-95.

32> See p177 above.

33> Richardson, op.cit., vol.1, p48.

34> Ibid., vol.1, p55.

35> Carol Gibson-Wood, 'Jonathan Richardson and the rationalization of connoisseurship', Art History, vol.7, no.7, March 1984, p54.

36> Roland de Freart (trans. John Evelyn), The Idea of the Perfection of Painting demonstrated from the Principles of Art, London, 1668, p63.

37> See above p177.

38> De Freart, op.cit., p67.

39> Kathryn McWhirter, The Independent on Sunday, 23 June 1991.

40> It is perhaps not without relevance that *the* top wine-tasting body, The Institute of Masters of Wine, conspicuously failed to answer my enquiries, while it is to a wine journalist, Kathryn McWhirter, (who in conversation was quick to condemn the elitist image from which her profession suffered) to whom I owe thanks for sharing her expertise with me.

41> William Hogarth, 'Brito-Phil Essay', St. James's Evening Post, 7-9 June, 1737 reprinted in Ronald Paulson, Hogarth: His Life, Art and Times, New Haven and London, 1971, vol.2, pp491-493.

42> George Tobias Smollett, Peregrine Pickle, (1751), Chapter 46

43> Joshua Reynolds, 'First Letter' to The Idler, 29 September, 1759, reprinted in The Literary Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds, London, 1855, vol.2, p124.

44> Laurence Sterne, Tristram Shandy, (1759), Book 3, Chapter 12.

45> Ibid., Book 1, Chapter 9.

46> Richardson's use of Lockean ideas and reasoned argument demonstrate his desire to promote learned and thoughtful connoisseurship cf. Gibson-Wood, op.cit.

47> Hogarth, op.cit..

48> Quoted in Iain Pears, The Discovery of Painting: The Growth of Interest in the Arts in England, New Haven and London, 1988, p197.

49> Richardson, op.cit., vol.1, pp75-97.

50> McWhirter, The Independent on Sunday, 6 September, 1992.

51> It is worth noting that the coffee-tasting trade, which has not undergone such popularisation, has not yet developed the use of 'flavour-wheels'. See McWhirter, The Independent on Sunday, 23 June 1991.

52> Judy Crosby Ivy, Constable and the Critics, Woodbridge, 1991, p29.

53> James Elmes, A General Bibliographical Dictionary of the Fine Arts, London, 1826.
e.g. 'Airy [from air]. In Painting - Gay, lively, resembling the effects of air. Applied to picture, when the light and aerial tints appear true to nature, and harmonized in colour and effect throughout the piece.'
As a gauge of the most popular contemporary vocabulary, Elmes' Dictionary is perhaps not very helpful as it seems that its entries are somewhat abitrary. For instance, 'sweet' was an adjective which had been part of the critical vocabulary since at least the seventeenth century (see above p222). It is included in Fairholt's Dictionary (1854) (see note 26 above) which was the second specialist art dictionary in English, but not in Elmes'.

54> Samuel Smiles, '"Splashers", "Scrawlers", and "Plasterers": British Landscape Painting and the Language of Criticism', Turner Studies, vol.10, no.1, Summer 1990.

55> Richardson, op.cit., vol.1, p186.

56> See above pp59-61.

57> Joseph Farington, The Diary of Joseph Farington, K. Garlick, A. MacIntyre and K. Cave (eds.), New Haven and London, 1978-1984, (29 April 1805).

58> The Examiner, 16 June 1816, p380

59> Blackwoods Magazine, October 1835, p486.

60> Blackwoods Magazine, October 1836, p549.

61> The Examiner, 22 May 1814, p334.

62> The Examiner, 29 June 1823, p425.

63> The Examiner, 5 June 1814, p366.

64> The Examiner, 30 June 1816, p412.

65> The Examiner, 16 June 1816, p380.

66> The Examiner, 23 May 1819, p335.

67> The Examiner, 6 June 1824, p361.

68> The Examiner, 24 May 1818, p332.

69> The Examiner, 14 June 1818, p379.

70> The Examiner, 20 May 1821, p317.

Notes to pages 237-244

71> See above p178.

72> The Examiner, 17 June 1810, p379.

73> The Examiner, 13 May 1821, p300.

74> Wornum, op.cit., p139.

75> The Examiner, 18 June 1815, p399.

76> William Hograth, Analysis of Beauty, (1753), Oxford, 1955, p133.

77> J. B. Bullen, 'A Clash of Discourses: Venetian Painting in England 1750-1850', Word and Image, vol.8, no.2, April-June 1992, pp113-123.

78> Ibid., pp113-4.

79> See above p202.

80> See above p152.

81> These years have been sampled from the middle of his career: 1800, 1801, 1803, 1806, 1807, 1808.

82> The Examiner, 29 May 1825, p344.

83> The Examiner, 24 June 1810, p396.

84> John Flaxman, Lectures on Sculpture deliverd at the Royal Academy, (1829), London, 1865, p130.

85> The Examiner, 4 June 18155, p365.

86> The Examiner, 27 June 1819, p413.

87> The New Monthly Magazine, 1 June 1819, p456.

88> See above p177.
It was also absent from the reviews which were furnished to the Morning Chronicle by George Cumberland in the 1780s. See his entry in Appendix III.

89> The Examiner, 25 May 1817, p332.

90> The Examiner, 9 May 1824, p298.

91> The Examiner, 22 June 1828, p405.

92> The Examiner, 8 July 1827, p419.

93> This is not to imply that it necessarily was Hunt who introduced 'clever' into the terminology of critics. It is simply an example to show how his changing use of the word could subtly alter its meaning.

94> 'Delicious' was not in Taylor's core vocabulary, nor in the reviews which George Cumberland sent to the Morning Chronicle in the 1780s. Robert Hunt's reviews appear to use the word with increased frequency during the second half of his career with The Examiner (e.g. 21 June 1818, 9 May 1819, 16 June 1822). The word seems to have been rather popular with William Paulet Carey (e.g. The New Monthly Magazine, June 1819, p455; July 1819, p546; [signed W.C.]. The Literary Gazette, 17 May 1817, p264; 24 May 1817, p285; 31 May 1817, p300 [signed W.C.] and see also p255 below)

Chapter Six

1> For the reason for its decline see Jerdan's entry in Appendix III.

2> See Jerdan's entry in Appendix III

3> William Jerdan, The Autobiography of William Jerdan, London, 1852-3, vol. 4, pp139-40.

4> See above pp4-5.

5> See above p146-148.

6> See his entry in Appendix III

7> See above pp66-68

8> In his Autobiography Jerdan described how in his role as editor he put his hand to almost everything. See his entry in Appendix III.

9> In 1829 The Westminster Review estimated that every newspaper was read by approximately 30 people (see Arthur Aspinall, 'The Circulation of Newspapers in the Early Nineteenth Century', Review of English Studies, no.22, 1946, p26). However, I have suggested a considerably more conservative estimate owing to Altick's finding which suggests that weekly papers were bought more for the purposes of private reading - see above p114.

10> This again is a conservative estimate based on the known circulations of Bell's Weekly Messenger (5,020), John Bull (4,500), and The Observer (6,860) which were the leading weekly papers in 1822 -see above p122.

11> See note 9 above.

12> See above p177.

13> Peter Cannon-Brookes (in Giles Waterfield (ed.), Palaces of Art (E.C.), London, 1991, p76), clearly indicates that the information bat for Westmacott's *Nymph and Zephyr* belonged to Tabley House.

14> Peter Cannon-Brookes, Tabley House Guidebook, The Tabley House Collection Trust, 1991, pp21-22.

15> See above p169 and p149.

16> Giles Waterfield (ed.), Palaces of Art (E.C.), London, 1991, p76.

17> Woburn has several bats of this type and Tabley House has one, later in date to the *Nymph and Zephyr* bat. Such a bat (from Holkham, Norfolk) is illustrated in G. Jackson-Stops, Treasure Houses of Britain, (E.C.), Washington, New Haven and London, 1985, p55. I thank Lavinia Wellicome for answering my enquiry concerning the Woburn bats.

18> Tabley House Cuttings Book (no catalogue number). I thank Peter Startup and other members of staff at Tabley for their assistance.

19> See above p5 and Appendix II.

20> I have been unable to locate the precise date of its first publication. Its subsequent publication (see note 23) refers to its having been first published in The Literary Gazette.

21> She received much adulation in his Autobiography, vol.3.

22> They included: *Portrait of a Lady* by Lawrence, *Juliet after the Masquerade* by Thompson, *The Combat* by Etty, *The Fairy Queen Sleeping* by Stothard, *The Oriental Nosegay* by Pickersgill, *A Child Screening a Dove from a Hawk* by Stewardson, *The Enchanted Island* by Danby, *Cupid and Swallows flying from Winter* by Dagley, *Fairies on the Sea-Shore* by Howard, *Love nursed by Solitude* by W. I. Thomson, and *A Girl at her Devotions* by Newton.

23> William B. Scott (ed.), The Poetical Works of L.E.L., London, n.d., p265.

24> The relevance of associationism must be noticed here. Although a topic too big to be considered in sufficient detail in the present instance (see above p212), both L.E.L.'s poem and the appeals which Jerdan's criticism make to the imagination (the latter, in spite of being based essentially on critical criteria derived from academic theory) suggest its influence.

25> William Paulet Carey, Memoirs of Lord de Tabley, London, 1826, p309

26> See above pp41-43 and his entry in Appendix III

27> See above pp244-5

Notes to pages 255-260

28> Peter Cannon-Brookes, Tabley House Guidebook, 1991, p21.

29> The Examiner, 22 June 1828, p405.

30> The New Monthly Magazine, 1 June 1828, p256.

31> In 1821 The Examiner's circulation was 2,750 and falling (see above p122). Ca.1830 The New Monthly Magazine's circulation was approximately 5,000. See Richard D. Altick, The English Common Reader, Chicago, 1954, Appendix C.

32> Joseph Farington, The Diary of Joseph Farington, K. Garlick et al (eds.), New Haven and London, 1978-1984, (17 June 1795).

33> R. B. Beckett (ed.), John Constable's Correspondence, Ipswich, 1962-1968. Examples include: I, p95; I, p201; II, p334; III, p40; VI, p153.

34> W. L. Pressly, James Barry (E.C.), London, 1983, p125.

35> We have already noted his comment, recorded by Farington, that he thought Taylor's criticisms were 'often well pointed'.

36> George Somes Layard, Lawrence's Letter-Bag, London, 1906, p25.

37> Ibid., p45.

38> Josiah Conder (pseudonym of Jonathan Charles O'Reid), The Reviewers Reviewed, Oxford, 1811, p10.

39> Ibid., p65.

40> Blackwoods Magazine, November 1824, p519-528.

41> Both quoted by Helene E. Roberts in Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (eds.), The Victorian Periodical Press, Leicester and Toronto, 1982, p85.

42> See above p163.

43> Quoted by Lewis A. Coser, Men of Ideas, London, 1967, Chapter 7.

44> Quoted by John O. Hayden, The Romantic Reviewers, London, 1969, p253.

45> See above pp17-18.

46> Claude Colleer Abbott, The Life and Letters of George Darley, (1928), Oxford, 1967, p158.

47> Ibid..

48> Interestingly he had much to say in support of Reynolds against Hazlitt. See Abbott, op.cit., pp160-161.

49> See above p214 and p226.

50> Although the obituary has already been quoted in full by Abbott, (op.cit., pp165-167) such is its relevance to the present study, that it has been considered valuable to requote a large portion of it in the present context.

51> John Ruskin, The Complete Works of John Ruskin, A. Wedderburn and E. T. Cook (eds.), London, 1903-12, vol.38, p336.

52> Abbott, op.cit., pp192-195.

53> Ibid., p196.

54> Fraser's Magazine, 1857, no.55, p619. Quoted by H. E. Roberts in Shattock and Wolff (eds.), op.cit., p86.

55> See above p38.

56> Andrew Hemingway, Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteenth Century Britain, Cambridge, 1992, p13.

57> Ibid., p107.

58> For The Literary Gazette and The New Monthly Magazine (both conservative) and for The Examiner and The Champion (both liberal) See his entry in Appendix III.

APPENDIX I

APRIL 1, 1825

THE LITERARY GAZETTE

FINE ARTS
SCULPTURE

AMONG the most beautiful works of modern art which the English School of Sculpture has produced, we have lately seen and admired a masterpiece by Westmacott. It is a Nymph and Zephyr. The former is about the size of the lovely Psyche, by the same artist; and resembles that exquisite figure in form and proportions. It is modestly, but finely draped, and the *ensemble* is truly graceful in every point of view. Delicacy and nature are what strike us as the prominent qualities. The infant Zephyr is sweetly disposed, as extending his arms and hands for the butterfly held by the Nymph. The expression of both countenances is tender and soft: the child rather playfully entreating, than teazing for the object of his wishes. Altogether the group is delightful; and we notice it with the greater pleasure on account of its having been secured by that noble patron of the arts, Sir John Leicester, to adorn his splendid gallery of the works of native genius. It needed but thus to add the efforts of the chisel to those of the easel, to raise him higher than he even stood before in the esteem and gratitude of every lover of our Fine Arts.

APPENDIX II

Nymph and Zephyr

And the summer sun shone in the sky,
And the rose's whole life was in its sigh,
When her eyelids were kiss'd by a morning beam,
And the Nymph rose up from her moonlit dream;
For she had watch'd the midnight hour
Till her head had bow'd like a sleeping flower;
But now she had waken'd, and light and dew
Gave her morning freshness and morning hue,-
Up she sprang, and away she fled
O'er the lithe grass stem and the blossom's head;
From the lilies' bells she dash'd not the spray,
For her feet were as light and as white as they.
Sudden upon her arm there shone
A gem with the hues of an Indian stone,
And she knew the insect bird whose wing
Is sacred to PYSCHE and to Spring;
But scarce had her touch its capture prest,
Ere another prisoner was on her breast;
And the Zephyr sought his prize again,-
"No," said the Nymph, "thy search is vain."
And her golden hair from its braided yoke
Burst like the banner of hope as she spoke:
"And instead, fair boy, thou shalt moralise
Over the pleasure that from thee flies;
Then it is pleasure, for we possess
But in the search, not in the success."

.....L.E.L. 1825

APPENDIX III

An Inventory of British Art Critics Prior to Ruskin

The presentation of the information gathered together in this Appendix follows the format of Kate Flint's doctoral thesis (see above p29), which included an inventory of identified critics for the period 1878 to 1910 and gave brief biographical details of each critic and other relevant information. The present inventory differs from Flint's, for in considering an earlier period, it relies on more scanty documentation and therefore it has been necessary to devise certain grounds for inclusion. Hence, each individual in the following list answers at least one of three criteria: at least one exhibition review has been attributed to his hand; evidence exists which suggests that he contributed to a fine arts column in a journal or newspaper; he set up or edited a periodical which published material particularly inclined towards the fine arts. These criteria are intended to single out those men who were, or were likely to have been, the authors of exhibition reviews. This means that artists and other individuals who wrote about the fine arts, but who used the press simply as a vehicle for publicising some particular issue or grievance are not included. This is not to say that the latter are any less significant, historically, but in so far as they were not 'professional' users of the periodical press and fall into a different category from that of art critic, it would be wrong to include them either in this list or the analysis which is provided in Chapter Two. The list considers writers working from the late eighteenth century until 1843 - a cut-off date chosen for being the

year in which Ruskin's Modern Painters (a work which undoubtedly marked a new era in the history of British art criticism) appeared. Although a few individuals, particularly Hazlitt and Thackeray have already received some considerable attention from previous scholars, and hardly need their biographical details reduplicated, it has been felt desirable to include brief outlines of their lives in order for the reader to have a ready reference in the analysis which follows. In addition, although such individuals may be well documented, information regarding their activities specifically as art critics are, in some cases, still spread over more than one source and it has been considered valuable to bring this information to one place. Any information for which a reference is not provided has been taken from the DNB.

ROBERT BALMANNO b.- d. c.1851

Robert Balmanno was Secretary of the Artists' Joint Stock Fund, a collector of Blake and Stothard, who seems to have gone to America at the end of his life <1>. At present, it is generally considered that he was the art critic for the British Press. This is suggested by a cutting from this newspaper which was sent or returned to him by J M W Turner in 1826. This cutting is from a Royal Academy Exhibition review which comments on Turner's paintings of that year <2>. It is known that Balmanno was acquainted with Constable <3> and with B R Haydon <4>.

SAMUEL BEAZLEY b.1786 d.1851

Samuel Beazley was born in Westminster and was the son of an architect and surveyor. He is known as an architect and playwright. His writings on art are not mentioned in the DNB, but Cyrus Redding mentions him as

having written on the 'arts' for the New Monthly Magazine sometime after 1821 <5>. He was evidently interested in writing at an early age and wrote plays whilst still a school boy. As a youth he voluntered for service in the Peninsula, but then became an architect, presumably receiving training from his father. He exhibited architectural designs at the Royal Academy.

WILLIAM PAULET CAREY b.1759 d.1839

William Paulet Carey was born in Ireland. He began his career as a painter, later becoming an engraver. Following an accident to his eyes, he gave up his profession, became a writer on the arts and a dealer, and was important in advising Sir John Fleming Leicester in the formation of his gallery. In addition to publishing books and pamphlets on art, often strongly advocating the case for better patronage of history painting, and often available free, he penned a number of political pamphlets. Later in life he moved from London to Birmingham, and died there in 1834. Evidence discussed in Chapter Two (pp41-42) shows that he contributed articles on the fine arts to The British Freeholder, The Worcester Herald, The Analyst, The Literary Gazette, and The New Monthly Magazine. The DNB mentions that he contributed to The European Magazine. He is known also to have contributed articles signed 'Evelyn, Jun.' in The Examiner, including a review of Haydon's *Entry into Jerusalem* on 17 September 1815 <6>. Drama reviews in The Literary Gazette which are accompanied by his initials (a signature which he is known to have used for some of his art reviews) are most probably by his hand (for example, 31 May 1817, p301).

HENRY FOTHERGILL CHORLEY b.1808 d.1872

Henry Fothergill Chorley, chiefly known as a critic of music and literature, is noted for his long association with The Athenaeum, which lasted from 1833 to 1866. He was born in Blackley Hurst in Lancashire, the son of a lock manufacturer. His father died when Chorley was only eight, and the family moved to Liverpool, receiving the support of a generous uncle. According to the DNB, in Liverpool, Chorley 'received sufficient instruction to develop his innate tastes for literature and music, and to render the mercantile office he was obliged to enter intolerable to him'. He began to contribute to periodicals aged nineteen, and three years later became an occasional contributor to The Athenaeum. In 1833 he entered the staff of this weekly paper officially, and thus he became 'the most prolific general reviewer of books, poetry, fiction, memoirs, drama and almost everything else... for a period of more than thirty years' <7>. Marchand's history of The Athenaeum states that a friend of Chorley's later years, Hewlett, claimed that 'The principal critiques upon exhibitions of works of art that appeared in The Athenaeum from 1836 to 1841, and several others of later date, were written by Chorley' <8>. He is not the only art critic of The Athenaeum to have been identified (see Cunningham, Darley, and Reynolds, below).

GEORGE CUMBERLAND b.1754 d.1848

Not famous enough to have been included in the DNB, details of George Cumberland's life have been described in G E Bentley's bibliography of Cumberland's writings <9> and information concerning Cumberland's friendship with William Blake has been published by Geoffrey Keynes

<10>. Neither Keynes or Bentley display knowledge of what Cumberland's father did for a living, but Keynes tells us that Cumberland's mother Elizabeth (née Balchen) belonged to a distinguished naval family. Cumberland was seventeen when his father died so had to earn an independent living at an early age <11>. He went into commerce and worked in the Royal Exchange Insurance Office from 1769 to 1784. However, he inherited £300 p.a. in 1784 which enabled him to become a gentleman of independent means. Before his inheritance, Cumberland became a student at the Royal Academy in 1772 where he made artist friends and exhibited in 1782 and 1783. His first contribution to the periodical press was 'Cold Comfort' (which concerned the unpleasantness of London streets) for the Morning Post which has been dated by Bentley as 1769. His regular role as art critic was for the Morning Chronicle and he wrote Royal Academy reviews for this newspaper in 1780, 1781, 1782 and 1784 <12> under the pseudonym 'Candid'. Cumberland also wrote books on art such as Thoughts on Outline, Sculpture and the System that guided the Ancient Artists in composing their Figures and Groupes... 1796 <13> and Outlines from the Antients exhibiting their Principles of Composition in Figures and Basso-Relievos 1829 <14>. In the first decade of the nineteenth century, Cumberland moved to Bristol and stayed there until he died <15>. Whilst in Bristol, Cumberland was much involved in the artistic life there and participated in sketching meetings in which artists resident in Bristol like Rippingille and Branwhite also participated, as well as the art critic John Eagles <16>. After moving to Bristol, Cumberland made many contributions to the newspapers which were published in that city <17>. Cumberland's writings however, were not solely conerned with artistic matters, but as

Bentley's bibliography illustrates, they embraced a wide variety of subjects from politics to poetry.

ALLAN CUNNINGHAM b.1784 d.1842

Described by the DNB as 'miscellaneous writer', Cunningham was born in Keir, Dumfriesshire and educated at a dame's school. His father was employed as a 'factor' (land-agent), at first to a Mr. Copeland of Blackwood House, Keir, and, when Allan was two, to Mr. Miller at Dalswinton. Cunningham's interest in literature was perhaps fostered by the fact that at Dalswinton, his father became neighbour and friend to Burns. Aged eleven, Cunningham became apprenticed to his eldest brother, a stonemason, but in his leisure time read all he could and started to write poetry. Some of his poems were published in Literary Recreations in 1807, and within the next two years he had begun an association with the publisher R H Cromek whom he tricked into thinking his ballads were old, rather than his own inventions. He moved to London in 1810, continuing to publish sporadically, and also gaining employment with a sculptor named Bubb. In 1814, he became Chantrey's secretary, a connection which lasted until Chantrey's death. He did not cease writing for periodicals after this appointment, but is known to have contributed to The Literary Gazette, Blackwoods Magazine, The London Magazine, and The Athenaeum. From 1829 to 1833 his Lives of the most Eminent British Painters, Sculptors and Architects was published, and shortly before his death he completed a biography of Wilkie which was published posthumously. It is known that at the beginning of Dilke's editorship of The Athenaeum (1830), Cunningham 'shared the Fine Arts Columns with John Hamilton Reynolds' <18>.

RICHARD DAGLEY b.- d.1841

An orphan, educated at Christ's Hospital, Dagley was apprenticed to Cousins, a jeweller and watchmaker. In those days this was a profession in which the ability to paint was a much required skill. Dagley later became acquainted with the enamelist Henry Bone and worked with him. In 1804 he published an illustrated volume Gems selected from the Antique, but moved away from London to Doncaster to accept a position as a drawing master in a lady's school, in order to improve his income. According to William Jerdan, he returned to London having been 'cut out at Doncaster' by a 'showy Frenchman whose talents would not have entitled him to tie his shoes; but he [the Frenchman] was gifted with superior qualities for success, and the quiet, studious Englishman had no chance with him' <19> and it is known that Dagley was living in Earls Court in 1815. The DNB says he was 'much occupied in reviewing books on art and illustrating publications' and Graves <20> shows him to have been a fairly regular exhibitor at the Royal Academy until 1833. Jerdan, the editor of The Literary Gazette, mentioned Dagley as a contributor to that journal implying that his connection had been for quite a lengthy period: 'Mr. Richard Dagley was an artist, whose information and taste in all that regarded the Arts, as well as his general talents, poetic fancies, and playful humour, were devoted to my work till the day of his death' <21>. Jerdan's comments suggest that Dagley's contributions were multifarious, but given his specialist knowledge, it is highly likely that he at least occasionally contributed to the Fine Arts column.

GEORGE DARLEY b.1795 d.1846

George Darley was born in Dublin. His father was a merchant and a grocer, but became a man of independent means c.1815. In this year, Darley went to Trinity College, Dublin. He obtained his B.A. in 1820 and after graduating moved to London. His first book The Errors of Ecstasie was published in April 1822. In the early months of 1823 he began writing for the London Magazine <22> and so started his career as a contributor to periodical publications. His art criticism written for the Athenaeum has been examined by Robyn Cooper (see p28 above) and by Claude Collier Abbott (his biographer) <23>, but he has also acquired notoriety as a poet and a mathematician. In addition to art criticism, he wrote drama reviews for The Athenaeum.

THOMAS FROGNALL DIBDIN b.1778 d.1847

Born in India, Thomas Frognall Dibdin was the son of a captain in the Navy. When Thomas was only four, his father died and so he was brought up by William Compton, an uncle. He was educated at Reading, Stockwell and Brentford, and went on to St. John's College, Oxford. He chose the bar as his profession initially, but later decided to take holy orders and was ordained a deacon in 1804, and priest in 1805, by Bishop North of Winchester. He became an author as quite a young man, contributed to the European Magazine and in 1797 published a volume of poems. He is best known as a bibliographer and he began his career in this field with an Introduction to the knowledge of rare and valuable editions of the Greek and Latin Classics published in 1802. He was editor of The Director, a weekly art periodical which ran from January to July 1807.

CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE b.1789 d.1864

Charles Wentworth Dilke was born in Bedhampton in Hampshire. His father worked in the dockyards in neighbouring Portsea, but in 1800 the Dilkes moved to London where Mr. Dilke (senior) was employed in the Navy Pay Office. In 1805 Charles Wentworth Dilke also entered the Navy Pay Office as a clerk, a profession he 'tolerated for more than thirty years' <24>. His first literary enterprise was to edit six volumes of Old English Plays, Being a Selection from the Early Dramatic Writers published by John Martin, 1814-1815 <25>. By 1818, Dilke had begun contributing to periodicals and was drama reviewer for The Champion from 11 January 1818 until 22 February 1818 <26>. In the 1820s he contributed articles to the London Magazine, Westminster Review, Retrospective Review, New Monthly Magazine, and the London Review <27>. In 1824 he edited the London Magazine and by 1830 was editing the Athenaeum. He continued to edit the Athenaeum until 1846, and contributed articles until 1853. He also edited the Daily News from 1846 to 1849 and established Note and Queries with W Thoms in 1850 <28>.

Dilke's biographer, William Garrett, has published a list of Dilke's writings <29> although this checklist does not attempt to be comprehensive, and Garrett's biography of Dilke (published a year later) includes some additions. Dilke's more frequent writings on the fine arts, his contributions to the 'Fine-Art Gossip' column in the Athenaeum are post-1843, but Garrett's list includes three exhibition reviews which were published in the 1830s <30>. In addition, Garrett's biography mentions an article entitled 'The Patronage of Art' published in the Westminster Review, July 1830 <31>.

EDWARD DUBOIS b.1774 d.1850

Described by the DNB as 'wit and man of letters' Edward was the son of William Dubois, a London merchant. Edward was born in London, educated at home, and called to the bar at the Inner Temple in 1809. As well as his career in law, the DNB tells us that 'he was a regular contributor to various periodicals and especially to the Morning Chronicle under Perry.' His principal contributions were art notices, dramatic criticisms, and verses on the topics of the day. His contributions also appeared in the Observer when it was under the same proprietorship. Dubois not only contributed to periodicals, but was involved in editing them. He edited The Monthly Mirror, and assisted in editing the first number of The New Monthly Magazine, but fell out with his co-editor, Thomas Campbell. For a few years he was editor of Lady's Magazine and The European Magazine. Dubois art criticisms in the Morning Chronicle and the Observer have been noted for their animosity towards Constable <32>, but his cutting remarks were a general feature of his writing. His poison pen eventually got him dismissed from the Morning Chronicle, when, in 1834, he made some offensive remarks concerning a portrait of the authoress Miss Harriet Martineau. Earlier in the year William Clement, who had owned both the Morning Chronicle and the Observer, had sold the former, and Whitley <33> has put forward this as an explanation for Dubois' dismissal and the apology which was published on 4 June. The Observer did not publish an apology and Dubois continued to write for it, and according to the DNB Dubois 'retained his position of art critic on the staff of the Observer' up to his last days.

HENRY BATE DUDLEY b.1745 d.1824

Henry Bate Dudley was born in Fenny Compton, Warwickshire, the son of the Rev. Henry Bate. The DNB remarks that he is said to have been educated at Queen's College, Oxford, but this has been contradicted by William Whitley <34> who claimed that Bate Dudley matriculated at Magdalen Hall. However, both the DNB and Whitley agree that he left university without a degree. Bate Dudley followed his father's profession and took orders. He succeeded to the rectory of North Fambrdge, Essex, upon his father's death and in about 1773 became curate to James Townley, the vicar of Hendon. He was the first editor of the Morning Post, established in 1772 and 'showed an interest in the fine arts by reviewing systematically the principal picture exhibitions, those of the Royal Academy and the Incorporated Society of Artists, which were the subjects of five or six articles in the spring of 1773' <35>. In 1780 Bate Dudley ceased as editor of the Morning Post and set up the Morning Herald which also took a considerable interest in the fine arts. In particular, Bate Dudley became known as a champion of Gainsborough. Whitley remarks that 'it is not known exactly when he disposed of the Morning Herald. There is reason for thinking that he was still proprietor in 1806, but he could not have taken any considerable part in its management after 1803 as he went to Ireland in that year, was given a living there in 1804, and was a good deal in that country until 1812' <36>. He was created a baronet in 1813 and died in Cheltenham in 1824.

JOHN EAGLES b.1783 d.1855

For an art critic of the first half of the nineteenth century, John Eagles has achieved some renown owing to the derogatory remarks he made concerning J M W Turner's paintings in a review of the Royal Academy Exhibition published in Blackwood's Magazine 1836. These remarks incensed the young John Ruskin so much that it inspired him to write a defense which eventually developed into the first volume of Modern Painters <37>. But if John Eagles' review of 1836 has become well known as the impetus which launched Ruskin's career as an art critic, Eagles' writings generally, like those of many of the critics of this period have attracted very little attention. Eagles himself has not yet been the subject of a full-scale biography though his writings for Blackwood's were numerous (including a fourteen instalment series called 'The Sketcher') and some of them have been published in a collected form <38>.

Eagles was born in Bristol and was the son of a merchant who later became the Collector of Customs at Bristol. John Eagles received an education at Winchester College and in his youth had ambitions of becoming a landscape painter. He toured Italy and also trained as an etcher. In 1823 he published etchings after G Poussin. In 1809 he had been an unsuccessful candidate for admission in the Water-Colour Society and subsequently decided to take orders entering Wadham College, Oxford. He gained his B.A. in 1812 and an M.A. in 1818. His first curacy was in Bristol, then he moved to Halberton in Devonshire in 1822, where he stayed for 12 or 13 years. He then moved back to Bristol and held his last curacy in Kinnersley, Herts., until he retired in 1841. After retiring, he moved back to Bristol and died there in 1855. Whilst

residing in Bristol, Eagles was involved in the artistic life there (see entry for George Cumberland) and even after moving to Devonshire, kept in close contact with Bristol artists <39>. He exhibited once at the Royal Academy (in 1808) and three times at the British Institution (in 1814, 1818, and 1852) <40>. Eagles was also friendly with John Mathew Gutch, the proprietor of Felix Farley's Bristol Journal from 1806 to 1844 <41> and contributed to this local newspaper using the pseudonym 'Themaninthemoon' <42>.

JAMES ELMES b.1782 d.1862

James Elmes was born in London and received an architectual training with George Gibson. He gained the Silver Medal for architectural design at the Royal Academy in 1804 and was a regular exhibitor at the annual show until 1842 <43>. His career as an architect was most successful and by 1809 he was vice-president of the Royal Architectural Society and Surveyor of the Port of London. He is notable as the editor of, and a contributor to, Annals of the Fine Arts, which ran from 1816 to 1820. He was a friend of B R Haydon and published many articles by Haydon in the Annals as well as supporting Haydon's views concerning the Elgin Marbles and showing sympathy with his anti-Royal Academy sentiments. He published books on the fine arts and architecture and produced another periodical publication, Elmes' Quarterly Review.

BENJAMIN ROBERT HAYDON b.1786 d.1846

Although Haydon answers one of the three criteria which entitle him to a place in this list - he penned at least a couple of exhibition reviews of works by his contemporaries: 'Review of the new Picture of Death on

the Pale Horse' (Annals of the Fine Arts, Vol.II, 1817, pp521-525), and 'Last Day of Wilkie's Exhibition at the British Gallery' (The Civil Engineer and Architiect's Journal, October 1842, p355 <44>) -in a certain sense it is misleading to include him in this list primarily intended to identify art critics and exhibition reviewers, for Haydon's use of the periodical press was in most cases simply the consequence of the desire to publicise his own opinions extensively. In this respect he falls into the category of individuals who used the press out of personal motives, and as has already been suggested, ought to be distinguished from 'professional' critics. For this reason, details of his life, which is any case very well documented <45> are not included here, nor is he included in the analysis of the careers of critics provided in Chapter Two. The prolific use which he made of the periodical press throughout his life has been given some consideration by Colbert Kearney <46>, who has put forward Haydon as the author of well over a hundred articles and letters to periodicals, eighty of which are signed B R Haydon or BRH.

WILLIAM HAZLITT b.1778 d.1830

As James Houk's reference guide <47> testifies, Hazlitt's life and writings have attracted considerable interest. The first extensive biography of his life appeared in 1902 <48> and his aesthetic principles have perhaps received more attention than most other periodical art critics of the period.

Hazlitt was born in Maidstone, but travelled much as a child while his father pursued a career as a Unitarian minister. As a young man Hazlitt was sent to the Unitarian College at Hackney, but he became

interested in writing and returned to his father's house in Wem, having given up any ideas of becoming a Unitarian minister <49>. In 1802 Hazlitt lived with his brother John, who had become a painter, with the idea of becoming a painter also and in the same year travelled to Paris to study the pictures in the Louvre. After his return he made a professional tour as a portrait painter in the north of England, but was not very successful in getting sitters. He exhibited twice at the Royal Academy, in 1802 and in 1805 <50>, but he did not pursue his artistic aspirations, and began to concentrate on developing his writing skills. His first published works were pamphlets and it was not until about 1814 that he began to write for periodicals, his first engagement being that of parliamentary reporter for the Morning Chronicle. He also wrote art criticisms for this newspaper and in 1815 was The Champion's art critic (see p14 above).

PRINCE HOARE b.1755 d.1834

The son of William Hoare R.A., Prince Hoare was born in Bath and educated at Bath Grammar School, as well as receiving instruction in art from his father. In 1772 he gained a Society of Arts premium and began studying at the Royal Academy. Four years later he visited Rome and studied under Mengs with Fuseli and Northcote. He exhibited works at the Royal Academy from 1781 until 1785, but also became interested in writing plays. His first of a number of plays was performed in Bath in 1788. In 1799 he was appointed honorary Foreign Secretary to the Royal Academy. He is notable as having been the editor of The Artist, a weekly publication which ran from March to December 1809. This

periodical was remarkable in that its contributions were written entirely by named professional artists <51>.

JOHN HOPPNER b.1758 d.1810

Of German extraction, John Hoppner was born in London and as a boy was a chorister in the Royal Chapel. Some speculation concerning his parentage was apparently encouraged by Hoppner himself <52> for as a youth (presumably after his voice had broken) he received a small allowance from George III to study as a painter. His mother was one of the German attendants (perhaps even a lady-in-waiting) at the Palace, the implication being that George III's benevolence had paternal motives. In 1775 Hoppner entered the Royal Academy and his career as a portrait painter was a steady climb to success. In 1782 he gained the Gold Medal at the Academy and in the same year married a daughter of Mrs. Wright, the celebrated modeller in wax. Ten years later he became an Associate of the Royal Academy, and in another three years was a full Royal Academician. The DNB tells us that he 'remained popular and prosperous to the last'. Whitley records that Hoppner was art critic for the Morning Post in 1785 and 1786 <53> and Farington mentions that he contributed to the British Critic in 1797 <54>. Hoppner's reviews for the Morning Post include complimentary critiquesof his own works.

ROBERT HUNT b.1774 d.1850

[See Chapter Three, Part i]

WILLIAM JERDAN b.1782 d.1869

Born in Kelso, Roxburghshire, William Jerdan was the son of a small landowner. He went to London in 1801 and became a clerk in the counting house of a firm of West India merchants. After an illness in the following year he got a job in the office of Cornelius Elliot, a writer to the signet in Edinburgh, but moved back to London in 1806 and became a reporter for the Aurora, a daily journal for West-end hotelkeepers. A couple of years later he had a succession of jobs: with the Pilot, then the Morning Post, and then as a parliamentary reporter for The British Press. In 1812 he bought The Satirist and in the following year became editor of the Sun. The friction which arose between Jerdan and John Taylor, one of the Sun's proprietors is described in Chapter Three of this dissertation. As a result of this conflict, Jerdan was relieved when he finally quit the offices of the Sun in 1817. In this year he became editor of The Literary Gazette, a weekly journal which eventually fell into decline when The Athenaeum reduced its price from 8d to 4d in 1831, and proved more competitive. From 1830 to 1834, Jerdan was involved in publishing an illustrated work of English biography: Fisher's National Portrait Gallery, but continued trying to keep The Literary Gazette going. He eventually sold it in 1850, but continued to write for other periodicals including Fraser's Magazine and Gentleman's Magazine. In 1852-3 he published his autobiography. In this work he describes his role as editor of The Literary Gazette: 'In my capacity I was omnivorous - at all in the ring - and produced hebdomadally, Reviews, Criticisms on the Arts and Drama, *jeux d'espirit* in prose and in verse; and in truth, played every part, as Bottom, the weaver wished to do' <55>. He also mentions his acquaintance with Sir John Fleming

Leicester <56>: a contact perhaps initated by William Carey. It seems that he was the author of The Literary Gazette cutting on the Tabley House information bat (see Chapter Six above)

JOHN LANDSEER b.1783 d.1821

John Landseer was born in Lincoln. His father was a jeweller who got John apprenticed to William Byrne, the landscape engraver. John Landseer pursued this career and exhibited for the first time at the Royal Academy in 1792. In 1806 Landseer was elected an associate of the Royal Academy but was critical of the Academy owing to its ruling which prevented engravers becoming full-members and petitioned for this cause throughout his career. In 1808 he started a short-lived periodical entitled Review of Publications of Art and in 1837 began another short lived periodical, The Probe. Review of Publications of Art, as well as reviewing fine-art books, also published exhibition reviews. Butlin and Joll have suggested that John Landseer was the author of these <57>.

EDWARD MAYHEW b.1813 d.-

Biographical information concerning Edward Mayhew seems scarce. Boase's Modern English Biography <58> gives him a mention, but his entry reveals very little about his life except the publications which he either wrote or edited, also to be found listed in the British Library catalogue. For someone documented as having contributed to a Fine Arts column (to the Morning Post some time before 1858 <59>) this makes curious reading for it mainly comprises veterinary books. Less surprising is a play, Make your Wills, a farce, written with G Smith, and a book on stage effects. Although Boase is unable to give the date of Mayhew's death,

Illustrated Horse Management was published in 1864, presumably when Mayhew was still living. Since the evidence concerning the precise dates of Mayhew's activities as an art critic is somewhat vague, we cannot determine whether he exactly answers the criteria for inclusion in this list: it is possible that his career as an art critic began after 1843 which strictly speaking would exclude him from this inventory.

WILLIAM HENRY PYNE b.1769 d.1843

William Henry Pyne was born in Holborn. He showed an early talent for drawing and was placed for instruction in the drawing school of Henry Pars, but refused to enter into apprenticeship with him. He first exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1790, but spent most of his career being involved in the production of fine art publications. He contributed much to the periodical press, often using the pseudonym 'Ephraim Hardcastle'. He wrote articles for the Literary Gazette, Arnold's Magazine of the Fine Arts, Library of the Fine Arts, and Fraser's Magazine. In 1824 under his pseudonym he edited the Somerset House Gazette, a weekly art periodical which carried art reviews possibly penned by the editor.

JOHN HAMILTON REYNOLDS b.1796 d.1852

Reynolds is chiefly known as a poet. He was born in Shrewsbury, but was brought up in London, his father being the head writing-master at Christ's Hospital. Reynolds went to St. Pauls and on finishing his education entered an insurance office. With an interest in literature, he began to write, and in 1814 two volumes of his verse were published.

In 1816 he became acquainted with Keats and the two developed an intimate friendship. Although Reynolds achieved some success with his poetry, he held on to the security of a conventional career and entered a solicitor's office in 1818. He travelled to the contintent in 1820 (where he wrote his last significant poems) and married in the following year, abandoning poetry for law. He did not stop writing altogether however, and contributed to periodicals, including The London Magazine and The Athenaeum, becoming a proprietor of the latter for a brief period. During 1830 and 1831 he was a contributor to the fine arts column of The Athenaeum, and wrote some of its exhibition reviews <60>. Some time around 1838 he moved to the Isle of Wight where he became clerk to the county court and where he spent the remainder of his days.

JOHN SCOTT b.1783 d.1821

A biography of John Scott has been written by Patrick O'Leary <61> and the two main periodicals of which Scott was editor The Champion and the London Magazine have received some scholarly attention. Scott was born in Aberdeen, the son of an upholsterer who sent him to Aberdeen Grammar School for his education. Scott continued his education at Marischal College, University of Aberdeen, but left before completing the final year of his degree which as well as Greek, history and natural philosophy, had included instruction in the principles of criticism and the belles lettres. On giving up his degree, Scott moved to London and got a job in the War Office as an assistant clerk. In 1807 he began editing The Statesman and perhaps The News and in 1809 set up his own weekly paper, The Censor <62>. The next newspaper that Scott became involved with was a Lincolnshire paper, the Stanford News and in 1813 he

became editor and proprietor of Drakard's Paper, a London edition of the Stanford News. The following year Drakard's Paper changed its name to The Champion and Scott continued to edit this periodical until July 1817 <63>. It was under Scott's editorship that William Hazlitt wrote the fine-arts column for The Champion <64>. B R Haydon, who became a close friend of Scott, also contributed to The Champion <65>. In 1820 the London Magazine was launched which Scott edited until he was killed in a duel in 1821; this duel had resulted from a quarrel with Blackwood's Magazine. During John Scott's editorship of the London Magazine articles on the fine-arts were contributed by himself, Hazlitt and Thomas Griffiths Wainewright.

MARTIN ARCHER SHEE b.1769 d.1850

The son of a Dublin merchant, Shee was born in that city. He received a classical education, but showing a talent for drawing, entered the Drawing Academy of the Royal Dublin Society, under Robert Lucius West. On leaving the academy, he set up as a portrait painter, first in crayons, then in oils. In 1788, he decided to broaden his horizons and went to London. Initially, he met with little success, but through the agency of a rich cousin was able to enter the Royal Academy as a student in 1790. Eight years later he was an Associate of the Academy and in 1800 became a Royal Academician. In 1805 he published his Rhymes on Art, which was followed by Elements of Art in 1809. He also wrote two novels and a play. He was involved in the foundation of the British Institution and in 1830 reached the pinnacle of his profession when he became President of the Royal Academy. Although he resigned from this position in 1845, popular demand persuaded him to continue and he

remained President until his death. Whitley mentions that Shee wrote art criticism for the Morning Post in 1794, when still a student at the Royal Academy <66> and Vainker <67> quotes examples of his critiques which bestowed no modest praise on his own paintings!

GEORGE STANLEY b.- d.-

Stanley has been identified as the fine arts writer for The Inquirer (1814-1815) and was an art auctioneer <68>. Of his life and activities as an art critic little is known. He lived in Bond Street, and in 1843 had hopes of succeeding William Seguier as Keeper of Paintings in the National Gallery, canvassing the support of Sir Robert Peel <69>. He had some connection with Annals of the Fine Arts for a sonnet by him 'On seeing the Portrait of Wordsworth, by Haydon' was published in volume three of that periodical in 1819 (Vol.III, Part IX, p332)..

JOHN TAYLOR b.1757 d.1832

[See Chapter Three, Part i]

WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY b.1811 d.1863

Described as 'novelist' in the DNB, Thackeray's fame rests in this field. However, his prolific contributions to the periodical press have received some attention from scholars. His writings which concern the fine-arts, often signed with the pseudonym 'Michael Angelo Titmarsh', fall mostly within the period 1837 to 1848 <70>.

Thackeray was born in Calcutta where his father was secretary to the Board of Revenue. When he was aged six, Thackeray was sent to school in England. In 1822 he entered Charterhouse, and in 1829 proceeded to

Trinity College, Cambridge. Here he remained for five terms, but left before sitting his finals. After spending six months in Weimar, Thackeray entered the Middle Temple in 1831. In 1833, Thackeray first became involved in journalism as editor of the National Standard, a short-lived periodical which ran from January 1833 to February 1834. During a visit to Paris in July 1833, Thackeray had begun to entertain notions of becoming a painter and after the collapse of the National Standard became increasingly interested in pursuing this profession. He studied with Henry Sass and George Cruikshank, then moved to Paris in September 1834 to copy the old masters in the Louvre. He also attended the Life Academy in Paris. By 1836 he had given up the idea of becoming a painter, became the Paris correspondent for the Constitutional and Public Ledger and from this date onwards he earned his living by writing <71>. His writings as an art critic are listed above <see p14>.

THOMAS GRIFFITHS WAINEWRIGHT b.1794 d.1852

Thomas Griffiths Wainewright's notoriety as a criminal has rather overshadowed his fame as an art critic and his life of crime has attracted much interest. The first full-scale biography of Wainewright appeared in 1938 <72> and subsequent books have appeared which take Wainewright as their subject <73>. Wainewright's periodical art criticisms have been published in collected form <74>.

Little is known about Wainewright's parents, <Curling speculates that his father may have been a pharmacist <75>>, but they both died when he was very young and Wainewright was brought up by his maternal grandfather, Ralph Griffiths, until 1803 when Griffiths died and an uncle took on the responsibility of looking after the child.

Wainewright had been exposed to a literary environment at an early age since Ralph Griffiths had founded the successful periodical Monthly Review in 1749. Wainewright received an education at Charles Burney's Greenwich Academy, but he did not go on to university, and aged nineteen years entered the studio of Thomas Phillips <76>. (There is some evidence that he was also a pupil of John Linnell <77>). As a youth Wainewright entered the army <78>, but by 1820 had quitted the army and in this year became a contributor fo the London Magazine, writing art criticisms under the pseudonyms Janus Weathercock, Egomet Bonmot, and Cornelius Van Vinkbooms. In the following year he began exhibiting paintings at the Royal Academy <79>, and in 1825 he was a candidate for an Associateship at the Royal Academy <80>. There is also some evidence that he may have written some of the catalogues for the Somerset House Exhibitions <81>. Wainewright's contributions to the London Magazine ceased in 1823 <82> and so did his career as an art critic. The rest of his life is a tale of financial problems, murders and forgery. In 1837 Wainewright pleaded guilty to a charge of forgery and was sent to Tasmania where he spent the rest of his life.

WALTER HENRY WATTS b.1776 d.1842

Walter Henry Watts was born in the East Indies and was the son of a captain in the Royal Navy. He was sent to England as a child and placed at school in Cheshire. He pursued two careers simultaneously: that of parliamentary reporter and that of miniature painter.

In 1803 he became a parliamentary reporter for the Morning Post and in 1813 joined the Morning Chronicle. In 1826 he briefly worked for the Representative, but returned to the Morning Chronicle and continued

being parliamentary reporter for this newspaper until 1840. The DNB records that 'during this time' (i.e. 1827 to 1840) he contributed criticisms on matters connected with the fine arts to the Literary Gazette, and Jerdan's autobiography also mentions him as a contributor (83).

Watts' career as an artist took off in 1808 when he became a member of the Society of Associated Artists in Watercolours and began exhibiting miniatures at the Royal Academy which he continued to do until 1830. In 1816 his success in the field of art was confirmed when he was appointed miniature painter to Princess Charlotte.

JOHN WILLIAMS b.1761 d.1818

John Williams was born in London and sent to the Merchant Taylor's School at the age of ten. He was apprenticed to the engraver Matthew Darly and also studied and exhibited at the Royal Academy (84). He launched his literary career at the age of eighteen by writing a defence of David Garrick and aged twenty went to Ireland to become editor of periodical publications. In 1784 he became associated with the Morning Herald. He was involved in a court case for libel in 1797 and subsequently emigrated to America and edited the New York newspaper The Federalist. He died in Brooklyn in 1818.

Williams is mentioned by Whitley as art critic for the Morning Post in the later years of the eighteenth century' (85) and identified as the author of the Morning Post review of the 1797 Exhibition of the Royal Academy (86). Whitley also identified John Williams as the author of the art criticisms published in the Morning Herald in 1809 and 1810 (87). Under the pseudonym 'Anthony Pasquin' Williams published

miscellaneous writings and satires concerned with the arts which are listed in DNB.

Notes to Appendix III

1> John Gage, Collected Correspondence on J M W Turner, Oxford, 1980, p239.

2> Ibid. pp99-100.

3> R. B. Beckett (ed.), John Constable's Correspondence, Ipswich, Vol.4, p415.

4> W. B. Pope (ed.), Diary of B R Haydon, Harvard, 1960, vol.1, p466, (entry for 15 August 1815).

5> Cyrus Redding, Recollections, London, 1858, vol.2, p169.

6> Clarke Olney, Benjamin Robert Haydon: History Painter, Georgia, 1952), p87.

7> Leslie A. Marchand, The Athenaeum: A Mirror of Victorian Culture, (1941), New York, 1971, p181.

8> Ibid. p147.

9> G. E. Bentley (Jun.), A Bibliography of George Cumberland, New York and London, 1975.

10> The Book Collector, Spring, 1970, pp31-65

11> Ibid. p32.

12> G. E. Bentley (Jun.), op.cit., pp xvii-xix.

13> Ibid. p15.

14> Ibid. p39.

15> Ibid. p xxi.

16> Francis Greenacre, Francis Danby (E.C), (Tate Gallery, London, 1988.

17> Bentley, op.cit., pp58-77.

18> Marchand, op.cit, p178.

19> William Jerdan, Autobiography, London, 1852-3, vol.3, p224.

20> Algernon Graves, The Royal Academy of Arts. A Complete Dictionary of Contributors, (1905), Bath, 1970.

21> William Jerdan, op.cit., vol.2, p188.

22> Claude Colleer Abbott, The Life and Letters of George Darley, (1928), Oxford, 1967, p33.

23> Ibid. Chapter 7.

24> William Garrett, Charles Wentworth Dilke, Boston, 1982.

25> Ibid. p5.

26> Ibid. p234.

27> Ibid. Mentioned in the Chronology preceding the main text

28> Ibid. Chronology

29> William Garrett, 'A Checklist of the Writings of Charles Wentworth Dilke' Victorian Periodicals Review, vol.14, no.3, Fall, 1981.

30> 'The Picture Gallery at Bologna' Athenaeum, 7 August, 1830, p492
'Suffolk Street Gallery' Athenaeum, 26 March, 1831, pp204-205
'Royal Academy' Athenaeum, 14 May, 1831, pp315-316

31> William Garrett, op.cit, (1982), p235

32> Judy Crosby Ivy, Constable and the Critics, Woodbridge, 1991, pp14-24.

33> William T. Whitley, Art in England, (1928), New York, 1973, vol.2, p?

34> William T. Whitley, 'Henry Bate Dudley', Walpole Society, vol.13, 1924-25, p27

35> Ibid. p28

36> Ibid. p64

37> see Tim Hilton John Ruskin: The Early Years 1819-1851, New Haven and London, 1985

38> Felix Farley, Rhymes, Latin and English by Themaninthemoon, Bristol, 1826.
A Garland of Roses, gathered from the poems of the late Rev. John Eagles by his friend John Mathew Gutch, London, 1857.
Essays contributed to Blackwoods Magazine by the Rev. John Eagles, Edinburgh and London, 1857.

39> Francis Greenacre The Bristol School of Artists (E.C.), (Bristol Art Gallery), Bristol, 1973, p244

40> Graves, op.cit.

41> D. F. Gallop 'Chapters in the History of the Provincial Newspaper Press 1700 to 1855', (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Reading, 1952), p178

42> Ibid. p284

43> Graves, op.cit.

44> Identified by Colbert Kearney: see note <00>

45> Tom Taylor (ed.), The Autobiography and Memoirs of B R Haydon, London, 1926.
W. B. Pope, The Diary of B R Haydon, Harvard, 1960. Plus numerous secondary sources.

46> Colbert Joseph Kearney, 'The Writings of Benjamin Robert Haydon' (unpublished PhD. dissertation, Cambridge, 1972), Biblioigraphy.

47> James A. Houk, William Hazlitt: A Reference Guide, Boston, 1977.

48> Austine Birrell, William Hazlitt, London, 1902.

49> Alexander Ireland, William Hazlitt: Essayist and Critic, London, 1889, ppxiii-xviii.

50> Graves, op.cit.

51> Anthony Burton, 'Nineteenth Century Periodicals' in Trevor Fawcett and Clive Phillpot (eds.) The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines, London, 1976, Chapter 1.

52> Richard and Samuel Redgrave, A Century of British Painters, London, 1947, p237.

53> William T. Whitley, Artists and their Friends, (1928), New York and London, 1968, vol.2, ?p39, p50.

54> Joseph Farington, The Diary of Joseph Farington, K. Garlick, A. MacIntyre, K. Cave, (eds.), (23 May 1797).

55> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.2, p179

56> Ibid. vol.2 pp257-261 and Vol.4 p131-147

57> See, for example, M Butlin and E Joll The Paintings of J M W Turner, New Haven and London, 1984, p18 and p45.

58> Frederick Boase, Modern English Biography, London, 1965.

59> Alexander Andrews, The History of British Journalism, vol.2, p277.

60> Leslie A Marchand, op.cit. pp174-5.

61> Patrick O'Leary, Regency Editor: Life of John Scott, Aberdeen, 1983.

62> Ibid. pp1-27.

63> Alvin Sullivan, British Literary Magazines 1789-1836, London, 1983, p104.

64> Josephine Bauer, 'John Scott's Champion', (unpublished PhD. dissertation, University of London, 1954), p29.

65> Colbert Kearney, op.cit. (1972), identifies four contributions. Josephine Bauer ibid., p22 mentions that Haydon contributed some letters on the fine arts whilst the periodical was being published as Drakard's Paper.

66> Whitley, op.cit.

67> Vainker, op. cit.

68> Joseph Grigley, 'The Zetosophian Society and the Inquirer: A Romantic Literary Circle and its Periodical' Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin, 1982, no.33, pp49-61.

69> British Museum Ms. ADD.40535 fol.337, George Stanley to Sir Robert Peel. 'Sir,

The Office of Keeper of the Pictures in the National Gallery being vacant by the death of Mr. Seguier, I presume to solicit your patronage in the Appointment...'

70> Judith L. Fisher, 'The Aesthetic of the Mediocre' Victorian Studies, vol.26, no.1, 1982, p69

71> Substantial biographical information is available on Thackeray, the main sources for this brief acount are: Lewis Melville William Makepeace Thackeray, London, 1927; Gordon N. Ray Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, Oxford, 1955.

72> Jonathan Curling, Janus Weathercock: The Life of Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, London, 1938.

73> e.g. Robert Crossland, Wainewright in Tasmania, Mellbourne, 1954; Tom Kenny From Unknown Cradle to an Unknown Grave, Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, Sidney, 1978.

74> William Carew Hazlitt (ed.), Essays and Criticism of T G Wainewright, London, 1880.

75> Curling, op.cit., p36.

76> Ibid. Chapter 1.

77> Crossland, op.cit., p7.

78> J Curling, op.cit, Chapter 1.

79> Ibid. Chapter 2.

80> Whitley, op.cit, (1973), vol.2.

81> Curling, op.cit., Chapter 3, p112.

82> Ibid. Appendix A.

83> Jerdan, op.cit., vol.2, p188.

84> Samuel Redgrave, Dictionary of Artists, (1878), Bath, 1970.

85> Whitley, op.cit., (1973), vol.1, p143.

86> Whitley, op.cit., (1968), vol.2, p215.

87> Whitley, op.cit., (1973), vol.1, p143.

APPENDIX IV

The True Briton, 25 May 179, p3

THE ARTS

It is the duty of a Public journal to record whatever may relate to the honour of the Country, and therefore we think it necessary to notice an Exhibition which was on Monday opened, in order to illustrate the works of our great Epic Poet. Mr. FUSELI, an Artist of peculiar turn of mind, and consequently whose genius is best fitted for subjects not to be found in ordinary nature, has for many years been employed in producing a Collection of Pictures founded on the Works of MILTON. The first series of this Collection was on Monday last presented to the Public, and they certainly evince great powers of imagination, and in many respects strongly embody the conceptions of the Poet. Works of this kind are not to be estimated by ordinary rules. They do not appeal to the outward sense, but address the imagination; and if the excite a powerful sentiment in the mind, they accomplish the only purpose for which they are intended. It may be observed, that if MILTON had any distinct images in his own mind of what, by its nature, cannot resemble any thing to be found on this "visible diurnal sphere," his conceptions must have been of the same kind as are presented in the works which now attract our attention. It is very easy for Critics, whose minds are not prepared for the higher pursuits of the Arts, to find occasion for ridicule in works that abound in marks of grandeur and sublimity. MICHAEL ANGELO, the greatest Artist in point of grandeur of conception which the world ever produced, did not, in his own time, escape the little criticism of little minds, and still to a mind not prepared for a due relish of his vast atchievement, many of his boldest flights may appear to be wild and extravagant. As Mr. FUSELI has endeavoured to follow the steps of that great "father of modern Art," as he was called by the late excellent President of the Royal Academy, he must of course expect to endure the same kind of censures. He may however console himself in the idea that his works will make a strong impression up on the higher and more cultivated order of judges. These observations apply to his works in general, but we must admit that there is

a great inequality of merit in them altogether. In the mere mechanical department of the Art, he has shewn a greater degree of merit than we have been accustomed to see in his works, but there are many of them that obviously did not issue from the same elevated state of fancy, and which are painted with too negligent a hand. On the whole, the Collection bears strong marks of a mind that fully enters into the conceptions of the Author he has studied, and that has been warmed in many instances into congenial energy.

APPENDIX V

	1808	1813	1818	1823	1828
Accurate	*	*	*		
Admirable	*	*	*	*	*
Animated		*	*	*	*
Beautiful	*	*	*	*	*
Bold	*	*	*		
Charming	*	*	*	*	*
Chaste				*	*
Classical	*	*		*	*
Clear	*	*	*	*	*
Correct	*	*	*	*	*
Delightful			*		
Delicate	*	*	*	*	*
Dignified	*	*	*	*	*
Easy	*	*	*		*
Elegant	*	*	*	*	*
Exact			*	*	
Faithful	*	*			
Fine	*		*	*	*
Firm	*	*			*
Forcible	*	*	*	*	*
Free	*	*		*	*
Fresh		*			*
Graceful	*	*	*	*	*
Grand	*	*		*	*
Harmonious	*	*	*	*	
Ideal					
Interesting	*	*	*		
Judicious	*		1		
Light	*	*	*		
Luxuriant	*		*		*
Manly					*
Masterly	*	*	*		2
Natural	*	*	*		*
Neat		*	*	*	
Picturesque					
Pleasing	*	*	*	*	*
Poetical	*	*	*	*	*
Pure		*		*	
Rich	*	*	*		*
Simple	*		*		
Sober	*	*	*		
Soft		*	*	*	*
Spirited	*	*			*
Striking	*	*	*		
Strong	*	*		*	*
Sublime		*			
Sweet			*	*	
Truthful	*	*	*	*	*
Unaffected		*			*
Vigorous	*	*	*	*	*
Vivid				*	
Warm	*	*	*		*

1 Injudicious, but not judicious was used in this year.
2 Master-hand, but not masterly was used in this year.

This table compares the approving critical vocabulary used by Robert Hunt in The Examiner, with that used by John Taylor in the Sun. The words in the left hand column represent the core of Taylor's positive vocabulary expressed as adjectives for convenience (for most of the words this was their usual form). * indicates that Hunt used the word (in any part of speech) in his Royal Academy review in the year given at the top of the column. Hunt's career with The Examiner spanned for 1808 to 1828: the table therefore samples his vocabulary at five yearly intervals. Obviously, Hunt's vocabulary each year varied depending on the length of his review and the nature of the works of art he chose to discuss. His reviews were generally longer than Taylor's and his vocabulary was considerably wider. Nevertheless, the table shows that Hunt's critical vocabulary had much in common with Taylor's. In 1813, Hunt used forty out of the fifty-two words which formed the basis of Taylor's vocabulary. Taken together, the five years sampled here, cover all of Taylor's core vocabulary, with the exception of 'ideal' and 'picturesque'. Other words which were unpopular with Hunt were: 'delightful' and 'manly', the latter being a particular favourite of Taylor's. Words which were popular with Hunt were: 'admirable', 'beautiful', 'charming', 'clear', 'correct', 'delicate', 'dignified', 'elegant', 'forcible' (often as a noun, i.e. 'with force'), 'graceful', 'pleasing', 'poetical', 'truthful' (often as a noun, i.e. 'with truth'), and 'vigorous'.

Bibliography

Books, articles, and unpublished dissertations

Abbott, Claude Colleer, The Life and Letters of George Darley, (1928), Oxford, 1967

Aglionby, William, Painting Illustrated in Three Dialogues, London, 1685

Allen, Brian, Francis Hayman, New Haven and London, 1987

Altholtz, Josef L., The Mind and Art of Victorian England, Minneapolis, 1976

Altick, Richard D., The English Common Reader: a Social History of the Mass Reading Public, Chicago, 1954

Altick, Richard D., The Shows of London, Boston, 1978

Andrews, Alexander, A History of British Journalism, London, 1859

Aspinall, Arthur, 'The Social Status of Journalists at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century', Review of English Studies, Vol.21, 1945

Aspinall, Arthur, 'The Circulation of Newspapers in the Early Nineteenth Century', Review of English Studies, Vol.22, 1946

Aspinall, Arthur, Politics and the Press, (1949), Brighton, 1973

Asquith, Ivon, 'Advertising and the Press in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries', Historical Journal, Vol.18, No.4, 1975

Barasch, Moshe, Theories of Art from Plato to Winkelmann, New York, 1985.

Barrell, John, The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt, New Haven and London, 1986

Bauer, Josephine, The London Magazine 1820-1829, Copenhagen, 1953

Bauer, Josephine, 'John Scott's Champion', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London, 1954

Beardsley, Monroe C, Aesthetics from Classical Greece to the Present, Alabama, 1966

Beckett, R. B. (ed.), John Constable's Correspondence, Ipswich, 1962-1968

Bentley, G. E. (Jnr.), A Bibliography of George Cumberland, New York and London, 1975

Bentley, G. E. (Jnr.), Blake Records, Oxford, 1969

Bermingham, Anne, 'Reading Constable', Art History, Vol.10, No.1, March 1987

Birrell, Austine, William Hazlitt, London, 1902

Black, Jeremy, The English Press in the Eighteenth Century, London, 1987

Blainey, Ann, Immortal Boy, London, 1985

Blunden, Edmund, Leigh Hunt: A Biography, London, 1930

Blunden, Edmund, Leigh Hunt's Examiner Examined, Archon Books, U.S.A., 1967

Boase, Frederick, Modern English Biography, London, 1965

Boyce, George, James Curran, Pauline Wingate (eds.), Newspaper History from the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day, London, 1978

Brisenden, R. F., 'Sterne and Painting', Books and Humankind, ed. J. Butt, London, 1964

Britton, John, The Fine Arts of the English School, London, 1812

Brooks, Elmer Leroy, 'Studies in The London Madgazine', unpublished doctoral thesis, Harvard, 1954

Brown, David Blayney, Augustus Wall Callcott, (Tate Gallery), London, 1981, (E.C.)

Brown, Lucy, Victorian News and Newspapers, Oxford, 1985

Bryson, Norman, 'Hazlitt on Painting', Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol. 37, No.1, 1978

Bullen, J. B., 'A Clash of Discourses: Venetian Painting in England 1750-1850', Word and Image, Vol.8, No.2, April-June, 1992

Butlin, Martin and Evelyn Joll, The Paintings of J. M. W. Turner, New Haven and London, 1984

Cannon-Brookes, Peter, Tabley House Guidebook, The Tabley House Collection Trust, 1991

Carey, William Paulet, A Descriptive Catalogue of a Collection of Paintings by British Artists in the possession of Sir John Fleming Leicester, London, 1819

Carey, William Paulet, A Desultory Exposition of an Anti-British System of Incendiary Publication, London, 1819

Carey, William Paulet, Memoirs of Lord de Tabley, London, 1826

Chamber's Encyclopaedia, London, 1781

Chase, Stanley P., 'Hazlitt as a Critic of Art', PMLA, Vol.39, 1924

Cipolla, Carlo M., Literacy and Development in the West, London, 1969.

Conder, Josiah, (pseudonym of Jonathan Charles O'Reid), The Reviewers Reviewed, Oxford, 1811

Cooper, Robyn, 'The Growth of Interest in Early Italian Painting: George Darley and The Athenaeum, 1834-1846', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute, Vol.43, 1980

Coser,Lewis A., Men of Ideas, London, 1967

Crossland, Robert, Wainewright in Tasmania, Melbourne, 1954

Crow, Tom, Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris, New Haven and London, 1985

Curling, Jonathan, Janus Weathercock: The Life of Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, London, 1938

Denvir, Bernard, The Early Nineteenth Century: Art, Design and Society 1789-1852, New York and London, 1984

Distad, N. Merrill, 'The Origins and History of Victorian Periodicals Review, 1954-1984', Victorian Periodicals Review, Vol.18, No.3, 1983

Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, London, 1754.

Dictionary of National Biography

Dryden, John, The Works of John Dryden, ed. A. E. Maurer, California, 1989

Egbert, Donald Drew, Social Radicalism and the Arts, London, 1970

Einberg, Elizabeth, Manners and Morals: Hogarth and British Painting 1700-1760, London, 1987, (E.C.)

Ellegard, Alvar, The Readership of the Periodical Press in Mid-Victorian Britain, Göteburg, 1957

Elliot, Philip, Newspaper History - from the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day, London, 1978

Elmes, James, A General and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Fine Arts, London, 1826

Errington, Lindsay, Tribute to Wilkie, Edinburgh, 1985, (E.C.)

Fairholt, F. W., A Dictionary of Terms in Art, London, 1854

Farington, Joseph, The Diary of Joseph Farington, ed. K. Garlick, A. MacIntyre and K. Cave, New Haven and London, 1978-1984

Farr, Denis, William Etty, London, 1958

Fawcett, Trevor and Clive Phillpot, The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines, London, 1976

Feaver, William, The Art of John Martin, Oxford, 1975

Finberg, A. J., Life of J. M. W. Turner, Oxford, 1961

Fisher, Judith L, 'The Aesthetic of the Mediocre: Thackeray and the Visual Arts' Victorian Studies, Vol.26, No.1, 1982

Flaxman, John, Lectures on Sculpture, (1829), London, 1865

Flint, Kate, 'The English Critical Reaction to Contemporary Painting 1878-1910', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1983

Fogle, Stephen F. (ed.), Leigh Hunt's Autobiography. The Earliest Sketches, Florida, 1959

Fonblanque, Albany, The Life and Labours of Albany Fonblanque, London, 1874

Fox-Bourne, H. R., English Newspapers: Chapters in the History of Journalism, London, 1887

Freart, Roland de, The Idea of the Perfection of Painting, John Evelyn (trans.), London, 1668.

Funnell, Peter D, 'Richard Payne Knight: Aspects of Aesthetics and Art Criticism in Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century England', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1985

Gage, John, Collected Correspondence of J. M. W. Turner, Oxford, 1980

Gallop, D. F., 'Chapters in the History of the Provincial Newspaper Press 1700 to 1855', unpublished M.A. thesis, Reading, 1952

Garlick, Kenneth, Sir Thomas Lawrence: A Complete Catalogue of the Oil Paintings, Oxford, 1989

Garrett, William, Charles Wentworth Dilke, Boston, 1982

Garrett, William, 'A Checklist of the Writings of Charles Wentworth Dilke', Victorian Periodicals Review, Vol.14, No.3, 1981

Gibson-Wood, Carol, 'Jonathan Richardson and the rationalization of connoisseurship', Art History, Vol.7, No.7, March 1984

Graves, Algernon, The Royal Academy of Arts. A Complete Dictionary of Contributors, (1905), Bath, 1970

Greenacre, Francis, The Bristol School of Artists, (Bristol Art Gallery), Bristol, 1973 (E.C.)

Greenacre, Francis, Francis Danby, (Tate Gallery), London, 1988, (E.C.)

Grigley, Joseph, 'The Zetosophian Society and the Inquirer: A Romantic Literary Circle and its Periodical', Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin, No.33, 1982

Harris, J, Lexicon Techicum, London, 1704-10

Haskell, F., Rediscoveries in Art, Oxford, 1976

Hayden, John O., The Romantic Reviewers, London, 1969

Haydon, Benjamin Robert, The Autobiography and Memoirs of Benjamin Robert Haydon, ed. Tom Taylor, London, 1926

Haydon, Benjamin Robert, The Diary of B R Haydon, ed. W. B. Pope, Cmabridge, Mass., 1960

Hazlitt, William, The Complete Works of William Hazlitt, ed. P. P. Howe, London, 1933

Hemingway, Andrew, 'Academic Theory versus Association Aesthetics: The Ideological Forms of a Conflict of Interests in the Early Nineteenth Century', Ideas and Production, No.5, 1986

Hemingway, Andrew, 'The Political Theory of Painting, without the Politics', Art History, Vol.10, September 1987

Hemingway, Andrew, Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteenth Century Britain, Cambridge, 1992

Hiller, Mary Ruth, 'THe Use and Misuse of Internal Evidence in Authorship Attributions', Victorian Periodicals Review, Vol,12, No.3. 1979

Hilton, Tim, John Ruskin: The Early Years 1819-1851, New Haven and London, 1985

Hipple, Walter John, The Beautiful, the Sublime, and the Picturesque in Eighteenth-Century British Aesthetic Theory, Illinois, 1957

Hogarth, William, Analysis of Beauty, (1753), Oxford, 1955

Holt, E. G. (ed.), The Art of All nations 1859-70. The Emerging Role of Exhibitons and Critics, Princeton, 1982

Houck, James A, William Hazlitt: A Reference Guide, Boston, 1977

Houghton, W. E. (ed.), The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900, Toronto, 1966-1989

Hughes, T. Roland, 'The London Magazine 1820-1829', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1931

Hunt, Leigh, The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt, ed. J. E. Morpurgo, London, 1948

Hutchison, Sidney C., The History of the Royal Academy, London, 1968

Ireland, Alexander, William Hazlitt: Essayist and Critic, London, 1889

Ivy, Judy Crosby, Constable and the Critics, Woodbridge, 1991

Jack, Ian, Keats and the Mirror of Art, Oxford, 1967

Jackson-Stops, G, Treasure Houses of Britain, Washington, New Haven and London, 1985, (E.C.)

James, Louis, Print and the People, London, 1976.

Jerdan, William, Autobiography of William Jerdan, London, 1852-3

Lord Kames, Elements of Criticism, London, 1762.

Kearney, Colbert Joseph, 'The Writings of Benjamin Robert Haydon', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 1972

Kearney, Colbert Joseph, ' B. R. Haydon and The Examiner', Keats-Shelley Journal, No.27, 1978

Kendall, Kenneth, Leigh Hunt's Reflector, The Hague, 1971

Kenny, Tom, From Unknown Cradle to an Unknown Grave. Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, Sidney, 1978

Kent, Christopher, 'Periodical Critics of Drama, Music and Art, 1830-1914', Victorian Periodicals Review, Vol.13, Nos.1 and 2, 1980

Lamb, W. R. M., The Royal Academy, London, 1935

Landseer, John, Lectures on the Art of Engraving delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, London, 1807

Layard, George Somes, Lawrence's Letter-Bag, London, 1906

Landon, Letitia Elizabeth, The Poetical Works of L. E. L., ed. William B. Scott, London, n.d.

Lee, R. W., Ut Pictura Poesis, New York, 1967.

Legge, J. G., 'The Examiner and William Blake', London Mercury, 20 May 1929

Lessing, G. E., Laocoon, (1799), Robert Phillimore (trans.), London, 1910

Levine, George and William Madden, The Art of Victorian Prose, Oxford, 1968

Lipking, Lawrence, The Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth Century England, Princeton, 1970.

Lippincott, Louise, The Career of Arthur Pond, New Haven and London, 1983

Marchand, Leslie A., The Athenaeum: A Mirror of Victorian Culture, (1941), New York, 1971

Mason, Eudo C., The Mind of Henry Fuseli, London, 1951

McWhirter, Kathryn, The Independent on Sunday, 23 June 1991 and 6 September 1992

McWilliam, Neil (ed.), A Bibliography of Salon Criticism in Paris from the *Ancien Régime* to the Restoration 1699-1827, Cambridge, 1991

Melville, Lewis, William Macepeace Thackeray, London, 1927

Miles, H.A.D. and David Blayney Brown, Sir David Wilkie of Scotland, (North Carolina Museum of Art), Radleigh, 1987, (E.C.)

Mineka, Francis E., The Dissidence of Dissent: The Monthly Repository 1806-1838, North Carolina, 1944

Moorman, Mary (ed.), The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth, Oxford, 1969-1970

Moses, Henry, The Gallery of Pictures Painted by Benjamin West, London, 1810

Norton, C. E. (ed.), The Letters of Thomas Carlyle 1826-1836, London, 1888

O'Boyle, L., 'The Image of the Journalist in England, France and Germany, 1815-1848', Comparative Studies in Society and History, No.10, 1968

O'Hara, J.D. 'Hazlitt and the Romantic Criticism of the Fine Arts', Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol.27, Autumn, 1968

O'Leary, Patrick, Regency Editor: Life of John Scott, Aberdeen, 1983

Olmsted, John Charles, Victorian Painting 1832-1848, New York and London, 1980

Olney, Clarke, Benjamin Robert Haydon: History Painter, Georgia, 1952

Osborne, Harold, The Art of Appreciation, Oxford, 1970

Owen, Felicity, and David Blayney Brown, Collector of Genius: A Life of Sir George Beaumont, New Haven and London, 1988

Park, Roy, 'The Painter as Critic: Hazlitt's Theory of Abstraction', PMLA, Vol.85, October 1970

Paulson, Ronald, Hogarth: His Life, Art and Times, New Haven and London, 1971

Pears, Iain, The Discovery of Painting, The Growth of Interest in the Arts in England 1680-1768, New Haven and London, 1988

Penny, N., Reynolds, London, 1986, (E.C.)

Pressly, W. L., James Barry, London, 1983, (E.C.)

Ray, Gordon N (ed.), Thackeray's Contributions to the Morning Chronicle, Illinois, 1955

Ray, Gordon N, Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, Oxford, 1955

Redding, Cyrus, Recollections, London, 1858

Rees, A. L. and Francis Borzello, The New Art History, London, 1986

Redgrave, Richard and Samuel, A Century of British Painters, (1866), London, 1947

Redgrave, Samuel, Dictionary of Artists, (1878), Bath, 1970

Reitlinger, Gerald, The Economics of Taste, London, 1961

Reynolds, Joshua, The Literary Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds, London, 1855

Reynolds, Joshua, Discourses, ed. Robert R. Wark, California, 1959

Richardson, Jonathan, Two Discourses, (1719), Menston, 1972

Riga, Frank P. and Claude A. Prance, Index to the London Magazine, New York and London, 1978

Roberts, Helene E., 'British Art Periodicals of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries', Victorian Periodicals Newsletter, No.9, 1970

Roberts, Helene E., 'Art Reviewing in the Early Nineteenth Century Art Periodicals', Victorian Periodicals Newsletter, No.19., March 1973

Roberts, Helene E., 'Trains of Fascinating and of Endless Imagery: Associationist Art Criticism Before 1850' Victorian Periodicals Review, Vol.10, No.3, 1977

Robinson, Henry Crabb, The Diary, Reminiscences and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson, ed. T. Sadler, London, 1872

Rosenthal, Michael, Constable, London, 1987

Ruskin, John, The Complete Works of John Ruskin, ed. A Wedderburn and E. T. Cook, London, 1903-1912

Schneider, Elisabeth, The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt, Philadelphia, 1933

Selden, Raman (ed.) The Theory of Criticism, New York and London, 1988

Earl of Shaftsbury, Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times, London, 1711.

Shattock, Joanne and Michael Wolff (eds.), The Victorian Periodical Press, Leicester and Toronto, 1982

Shee, Martin Archer, Rhymes on Art, (second edition), London, 1805

Sherman, Clare Richter, and Adele Holcomb, Women and Interpreters of the Visual Arts 1820-1979, London, 1981

Smiles, Sam, '"Splashers", "Scrawlers", and "Plasterers": British Landscape Painting and the Language of Criticism', Turner Studies, Vol.10, No.1, Summer 1990

Smollett, George Tobias, Peregrine Pickle, London, 1751

Sterne, Laurence, Tristram Shandy, London, 1759

Stout, George Dumas, The Political history of Leigh Hunt's Examiner, St. Louis, 1949

Sullivan, Alvin, British Literary Magazines 1789-1836, London, 1983

Symon, J. D., The Press and its Story, London, 1914

Taylor, John, Records of My Life, London, 1832

Taylor, John, Poems on Various Subjects, London, 1827

The Times, The History of The Times, London, 1935

Vann, Don J. and Rosemary T VanArsdel (eds.), Victorian Periodicals: A Guide to Research, New York, 1989

Vainker, Philip, 'Art Criticism and Art Reviewing 1780-1830', unpublished M.A. thesis, Courtauld Institute, 1977

Venturi, Leonello, The History of Art Criticism, New York, 1964

Verdi, Richard, Nicolas Poussin: Tancred and Erminia, Birmingham, 1992, (E.C.)

Wadsworth, A. P., Newspaper Circulations 1800-1954, Manchester, 1955.

Wainewright, Thomas Griffiths, Essays and Criticisms of T G Wainewright, ed. William Carew Hazlitt, London, 1880

Walker, Richard, Regency Portraits, London, 1985

Waterfield, Giles, Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain 1790-1990, 1991 (E.C.)

Weintraub, Stanely, Whistler: A Biography, London, 1974.

Whitley, William T., 'Henry Bate Dudley', Walpole Society, Vol.13, 1924-25

Whitley, William T., Art in England, (1928), New York, 1973

Whitley, William T., Artists and their Friends, (1928), New York and London, 1968

Wornum, Ralph, Lectures on Painting by the Royal Academicians, London and Bohn, 1848

Zmijewska, Hélène, 'La Critique des Salons en France avant Diderot', Gazette des Beaux Arts, 6th Series, Vol. 76, July-August 1970

Periodicals

Academic Annals, 1804-1809

Ackermann's Repository, 1809-1829

Annals of the Fine Arts, 1816-1820

The Athenaeum, 1828-1921

Blackwoods Magazine, 1817-1906

The Champion, 1814-1822

The Examiner, 1808-1881

Fraser's Magazine, 1830-1882

Gentleman's Magazine, 1736-1907

John Bull, 1820-1892

The Literary Gazette, 1817-1862

The London Magazine, 1820-1829

The Monthly Magazine, 1796-1843

The Morning Chronicle, 1769-1865

The New Monthly Magazine, 1814-1884

The Penny Magazine, 1832-1845

The Porcupine, 1800-1802

The Reflector, 1810-1811

Review of Publications of Art, 1808

Somerset House Gazette, 1823-1824

The Sun, 1792-1876

The Times, 1785-

The True Briton, 1793-1804

Manuscripts and other unpublished sources

British Museum ADD. MSS.40535, Fol.337 George Stanley to Sir Robert Peel
British Museum ADD. MSS.39781, Fol.299 Robert Hunt to John Flaxman
Victoria and Albert Museum Press Cuttings P.P17G
The Tabley House cuttings book (no catalogue number)
File of late eighteenth century press cuttings pertaining to the fine arts, Paul Mellon Centre, London.